

# AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW

Vol. XLII.—No. ~~153~~ 154

---

MARCH, 1884.

---

## MINISTERIAL SUPPORT.

**A**MONG the anniversaries which occurred during the late meeting of the General Convention was that of the Woman's Auxiliary to the Board of Missions. That organization sprang out of a desire to supplement the meagre maintenance of Missionaries by contributions, mainly in kind. It has greatly grown and prospered, and its latest anniversary, now that it has come to cover a much wider ground and to do a much more various work than it originally set out to do, was very naturally an occasion of warm congratulation. Bishops and Clergy vied with each other in speaking words of merited commendation and approval, and the air was full (a little too full perhaps,) of the notes of rejoicing and felicitation.

A little too full, perhaps, I have ventured to suggest, not because the work was not good and praiseworthy, but because it still leaves undone that larger work which ought, long ago, to have made it unnecessary. The Bishops and Clergy were in the Chancel, and the Churchwomen, in accordance with the orderly usage of the Church, in the pews. But suppose one of these latter to

have been allowed the privilege to say what must have been often in the hearts, if not on the lips, of earnest men and women in this Church of ours, would it not perhaps have been something like this: O, Reverend and Right Reverend Fathers, Brethren of the Clergy and laity, See what your indifference, your parsimony, your self-indulgence constrain us to do. We cannot atone for your neglect of an underpaid and half-starved ministry. We cannot compensate our Master's servants for what you owe to them. But we have organized this Sisterhood of Mercy to the Clergy, that you and all the world may be anew reminded of that debt which the Church owes to her workmen—owes, and will not pay. As we rehearse to you the history of our endeavors, we charge you to remember that what we have given as a dole was owed by us all as a debt. As we read to you the grateful acknowledgments of heroic men and women who are enduring privations of an Apostolic hardness with the patience and courage often of martyrs, we bid you to remember that neither you nor we have any right to such acknowledgments. These words of gratitude for a few garments which were not ours to give, but belonged of right to them to whom they were sent, ought they not to mantle your cheeks and ours with shame as we realize how little we deserve them! Understand then—these are the words which such an one might speak, out of a full heart, understand then, brother laymen and sister lay-women, understand then, ye fathers and brethren of the ministry in high places; understand then, ye city Rectors, whose voices ought to be lifted up louder than all others in protest against the Church's neglect and indifference concerning those brethren who are struggling and suffering in the regions round about, that this Association exists to rebuke such neglect, to reprove such indifference, and to protest against both the policy and the principles that inspire them.

For one, I should bow to that rebuke without a word. When some Bohemian scribbler from his safe obscurity shoots his envenomed arrow at what he calls a luxurious city clergy, one can afford to treat him and his falsehoods

with the contemptuous indifference which both alike deserve. For I know, as he knows or might know if he chose that if any such body exists in this age it is certainly not in this land, since, in the wealthiest communities not less than in smaller towns, a clergyman's salary is usually graduated with the nicest reference to what will barely enable him to meet the social demands upon him and to make a decent appearance, and to do absolutely nothing more; that while, leaving out the rewards of commercial life altogether, the earnings of other professions—the law and medicine, are counted by tens and sometimes by hundreds of thousands, and that while, in scores of pulpits in our cities, there are men who are the intellectual peers of the foremost men in those communities in which they live, and who in any other profession would very speedily have won both wealth and ease, as a matter of fact no city clergyman by means of his professional compensation ever attains to either. And knowing this, one is constrained to regard with very meagre respect either for his intelligence or his candor anybody who talks about the luxurious self-indulgence of metropolitan clergy.

But when I turn to my brother in some distant missionary field who is fighting the devil on five hundred dollars a year, with which he has to maintain a family and educate his children, with which he must dress like a gentleman though he is paid like a pauper, with which he must groan under the burden of a worry for bread and a watchfulness for souls—then, I confess I am dumb and ashamed. For from me and others whose more comfortable maintenance gave them freedom to speak, even as it ought to have inspired them with generosity to sympathize, he and those living in like straits with himself had a right to expect a rebuke of the Church's niggardly policy, and a protest against the sinfulness of her easy indifference.

And as one of these I am unwilling to be silent any longer. I am constrained to affirm that there is no neglect or omission which stains the Church's record to-day more grievous, more hurtful, more damaging to her influence,

more obstructive of her progress than the support which she provides for her clergy. I believe that she is deliberately driving from her threshold the best energies of youth, the best aspirations of intellectual ardor, the finest culture and scholarship of her own children; that the standard of ability and attainments which ought to distinguish her ministry is gradually but steadily deteriorating; that, in an age which demands not less of learning but more, not a lower standard of excellence but a higher, in an age when hostility to the Faith, moving forward hand in hand with the most affluent culture was never so aggressive as it is to-day, she is not multiplying her defenders of the Faith but diminishing them. I believe in a word, that her provision for the maintenance of any studious, earnest, single-minded, truly Christ-like man who would fain enter her ministry, is ordinarily so mean and meagre, as to amount almost to a downright prohibition at its threshold.

And I am moved to say this, not in any spirit of merely rhetorical exaggeration, but upon the basis of demonstrable facts. Let me name one or two of them.

(a) Not a great many years ago an association of gentlemen in New York, of whom the Bishop of New York was one, organized themselves into a corporation for the promotion of Life Insurance among Clergymen. In connection with its operations it became important to this Association to ascertain the average compensation of the ministry of our own and other communions. The results of these enquiries were published, and it appeared that the lowest scale of compensation to be found in any religious body of any name is that which obtains in the Protestant Episcopal Church. The Communion which pays its Ministers the best, is that Communion (the Methodist) which has always been supposed to include the largest proportion of persons of humble circumstances, and to provide for her Ministers the most stinted subsistence, while our own Church—commonly called the Church of the wealthy, pays her clergy upon an average between five and six hundred dollars.

(b) Again. At a recent meeting of a Woman's Auxiliary Association, its members were addressed by a



Western Bishop\* who told them of the comfort which their work had carried to many homes in his missionary jurisdiction, and in illustration of the fact mentioned that one Clergyman to whom the Association had sent was compelled to support himself, a wife and children on *three hundred dollars*. He added with reference to another case where the Association had furnished clothing for a family, that so narrow were their means that, without such aid from without they would have been left absolutely naked, since their missionary stipend barely sufficed to supply them with food and fuel.

Here in other words, was an educated man, and a refined and delicate woman (for, as a class, the wives of the Clergy are the peers in culture and intelligence of their husbands), who were doomed to maintain themselves on a stipend that a mechanic would have scorned, that a brakeman on a railroad would have refused, and that even a day-laborer in the streets would have told his employer a year ago was insufficient for his needs.

(c) Is it any wonder that it follows from this that the quality of the ministry deteriorates? If any one disputes that fact let him take the catalogues of our Theological Seminaries and compare the proportion of college graduates now and twenty years ago. While the cost of living, of education, of books, of everything that is necessary to a clergyman's existence and usefulness has, within the last quarter of a century, more than doubled, if not trebled, the stipends of the clergy have in many instances scarcely increased at all, and as a consequence of this many who are willing enough to make sacrifices and endure hardness are turned away from a calling in which their support is so penurious as to make independence, a decent self-respect, and most of all a whole-hearted devotion to their work almost impossible. It is said sometimes that any man who is kept out of the ministry by any question of support, has demonstrated, beforehand, his unfitness to be in it. The statement is as

\*The fearless and self-sacrificing Bishop of Nebraska, whose ringing and inspiring voice has, since these words were written, and as it seems to us, all too soon, been stilled in death.

false as it is irrational. If a man sees beforehand that the vast majority of the clergy are without anything approaching an adequate maintenance, and that, for want of that maintenance hundreds of them are broken in health or in spirit before they reach middle life,—that the furnishing of one's mind—the replenishing of his scanty store of books, nay even the adequate feeding and clothing of one's household, are all but impossible; if he sees still further, that the poverty of themselves and their children is a constant temptation to the clergy to be intriguing for promotion instead of working diligently in their appointed cures and waiting to be sought,—if he sees, in a word, that downright penury in the ministry, as any where else, will starve a man's mind as well as his body and pauperize his spirit as well as his speech, then I maintain that he does rightly to hesitate before entering upon a calling in which he knows beforehand, grinding care and ceaseless anxiety for others, coupled with a sense of utter helplessness, will largely cripple, if they do not absolutely destroy his usefulness. It is time for the Church to understand that if the Christian ministry is to be the power that it ought to be among us, it will be when the Church has had the wisdom and the justice to lift it to such a position of decent and self-respecting independence, as shall release it from the cringing spirit of anxious servility and the dreary hopelessness of inevitable want.

But again. It is said, very often, that the life of penury to which the clergy are doomed, is one which becomes their calling, in which one ought to set an example of abstinence and simplicity, and self-denial. But what is the value of an example of self-denial that is wholly involuntary? How shall I be influenced by the example of the silence under insult of my neighbor, when I happen to know that he was born deaf and dumb? How shall I admire the honesty of yonder servant of a bank, when I know that he has never been allowed to enter in vaults, or, under any pretext whatever, to touch one dollar of its funds? The value of self-denial, depends upon its being voluntary; but to compel a man to starve and

then hold him up to the world as an illustration of heroic abstinence is only a little more absurd than it is cruel. First let us give the clergy the means of living respectably, and then we may rightly call upon them to set us an example of Christian moderation.

And if it be asked at this point, what is to be understood by "living respectably," by a "decent maintenance" and like terms—what, in a word ought to be the *standard* of ministerial support. I submit that the question is answered in those words of the Apostles which we have among the Offertory sentences: "Let him that is taught in the word minister unto him that teacheth in *all good things*." Could there be anything broader or clearer as a rule of practice, and can we find in such words any warrant for the notion that the clergy are to be a mendicant class hanging about the back doors of the rich—relegated, as in the reign of Charles the II, to the kitchens of the nobility and the sculleries of the great? It is urged, indeed that S. Paul himself lived a life of great privation if not often of downright poverty, that he was so far from being comfortably maintained in his ministry that he wrought at his trade as a tent-maker to support himself; all which is true, true enough, but entirely aside from the real question at issue, which is, whether the Christians of the Apostolic age did not minister to him in all good things—whether, in fact S. Paul was not maintained as comfortably and generously as these primitive Christians maintained themselves? The simple truth is that S. Paul lived of very necessity, precisely as the people among whom he labored lived. The first converts to Christianity were not generally among the wealthy, and the Apostle shared their lot, as what servant of his Master would not have rejoiced to do? He wrought at his trade simply because, in that first stage of the planting of the Church, there was no organized body to provide for his support. But while he wrought, he wrote, and this is the law that he lays down "let him that is taught in the word minister to him that teacheth in all good things." If any one can find in such words any warrant for the theory that there is to be one scale

of living for a Christian laity and another and meaner one for the Christian ministry I can admire his ingenuity but it must needs be at the expense of my respect for his honesty. The reasonable comforts that any Christian man or woman may allow to themselves belong of right to those who are ministers of the Altar of God, and the withholding of what is due on the one hand, that it may be expended in luxury and self-indulgence on the other, is at once the emasculation of our common Christianity, the shame of the Church, and the curse of her people.

For let us remember that we may not dis sever the first member of the passage I have quoted from its last and consequent. We must "not be deceived, God is not mocked." It is eternally true that whatsoever a man, or a Church, sows that, and not something else, they shall reap. And so the Church that sows starvation will reap starvation. If it poorly feeds its priests, whether their minds or their bodies, it will be poorly fed in turn. The age of miracles is past. There is no manna from heaven to replenish the parsonage table. The clergy cannot, any more than the captive Israelites, make bricks without straw. If therefore they are to do something more than starveling work, they must have something more than starveling support. The Church will reflect in its progress, or want of progress its own treatment of them, just as inevitably as a mirror reflects the face that looks into it.

And so, for the sake of the cause and Kingdom of CHRIST in our land, we want, I believe, far more than we want a score of other things on which we are spending our strength and breath and energies, a wise, large and well considered scheme for the adequate sustentation of the clergy. The example that other religious bodies have so lately and so opportunely set us, we want the energy and the candor to follow. We want a general and concerted movement for the better support of our missionary and rural clergy. We want to stop sighing and saying "It is very sad and painful, but what can be done about it?" and, instead, strike hands and resolve before God that something *shall* be done! And most of all, we of the clergy, whose personal circumstances place us be-

yond the suspicion of being influenced by any sense of individual grievance want to espouse the cause of those in regard to whom, there are at least some among us who have felt moved to cry "we are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul when he besought us and we would not hear."

What is it, then, that we may do? The most effectual lever in all reforms is the power of example. Is the spirit of an unselfish chivalry grown so cold that those whose maintenance is relatively adequate and comfortable may not do something among themselves which shall move others to do more? There are probably five hundred Bishops and Clergy in the American Church whose incomes are as much as, or over, \$3,000 per annum. A charge of two and a-half per cent upon such an income would be \$75. A charge of two and a half per cent upon five hundred salaries of \$3,000 each would produce \$62,500 per annum. It is not a very large sum to be divided among two thousand clergy, more or less, whose salaries do not amount to \$1,000 a year each, but it would be large enough to move the hearts of generous laymen who saw such an evidence that their brethren of the clergy were in earnest, to make it larger. It would awaken an interest and inaugurate a movement which would grow to something worthy of the emergency.

(d) And so soon as that interest had been awakened, it would be appropriate to consider, *e.g.*, such a wise and successful scheme as has long been in operation in Scotland, the Established Church—a scheme which is administered unless I am mistaken, in both the "Free Kirk" and in connection with what is known as the "Sustentation Fund." Under this plan, feeble Churches are aided in supporting their ministers by appropriations which are arranged upon a scale graduated according to the contributions of the people. The aid from without is thus made an incentive to effort from within, and a relatively weak parish is often enabled to retain the services of one whose ministrations it especially prizes, by being re-inforced at a critical moment with aid which simply doubles its own increased contributions.

(e) Along with some such plan, there should be another not unlike it, which should include both effort from within and co-operation from without, to secure the partial (not complete) endowment of parishes. Complete endowment discourages the giving habit of the people. Partial endowment secures the partial independence, and so contributes to the freedom from care and the self-respect, of the minister. It is a cheering sign that in some of our larger cities and most useful parishes, such as the Church of the Transfiguration and S. Ann's Church in New York, and in S. Andrew's Church Philadelphia, this plan has already been inaugurated.

(f) Again: In every organized Diocese there might well be fixed a minimum standard of salary, at which, through such agencies as I have suggested the salaries of the clergy ministering in feebler parishes should be maintained.

And finally, the whole matter, with its often cruel hardships to sensitive and defenseless natures, should not be left to the carelessness, the caprice, the niggardly parsimony of those who talk of "hiring" a minister as they would hire a horse—nor yet to their unreflecting and unenlightened inconsiderateness. There must be some voice somewhere that will speak to the laity gently, but plainly and explicitly. Here the poorly paid clergy may not plead for themselves. To whom may they look to plead for them if not to those who are their brethren? It has been sometimes remarked by observant laymen that of all classes, the clergy seem to have least of what, among men of the world, is called *esprit de corps*, and a cynical man of letters once remarked that when clergymen set about discussing one of their own Order, "it generally amounted to an invitation to view the remains." If such a charge be undeserved,—if the charity of the clergy for one another be larger and more loving than the world believes, may it not be worth while to consider whether it is not time that it should find some more practical and fraternal expression?

HENRY C. POTTER.



## WILLIAM SHELTON, D. D.

THERE stands to-day in the city of Buffalo a stately Church building which is thought to be one of the most perfect representations of pointed architecture in this country. S. Paul's Cathedral Church however is more interesting because it represents the almost life work of one who was its Rector for over a half century and who is the subject of this biographical sketch.

The Rev. William Shelton was the fourth son of the Rev. Philo and Lucy Shelton, and was born in Fairfield, now Bridgeport, Connecticut, September 11, A.D., 1798.

His father is said to have been the first clergyman ordained by Bishop Seabury. Though this statement is disputed the correction ought not to be made without positive documentary evidence, as the writer has heard the son affirm it as a well known fact. The further we live from the date of the consecration of the first Bishop the more important becomes this fact, and now when the Church in Scotland is about to celebrate the event, it is most interesting to find that the Rev. Dr. Wm. Shelton deceased within a year, is but one remove from the first American Bishop.

His father was born in Ripton, Conn., May 5, A.D., 1754, and came of the staunch Church stock, for his grandfather was the famous Daniel Shelton who was persecuted by "the Independents" for his Church principles in early colonial days.

The Rev. Philo Shelton began his studies under the Rev. Wm. Scoville in Waterbury, and read service as a Lay Reader in his native town as the following receipt shows:

Received of Mr. Abijah Shelton ten pounds nineteen shillings in Continental bills for part payment for reading prayers in the parish of Ripton, 1778. Received per me,

PHILO SHELTON.

Those who are familiar with the history of the Church in Conn. will see how important these names and incidents become in relation to the beginnings of the Church in this land. He graduated from Yale College July 25, 1775, when the Rev. Dr. Stiles was the president, and was ordained to the Diaconate in CHRIST Church, Middletown, Aug. 3d, 1785, and in the same year advanced to the Priesthood in Trinity Church, New Haven.

He was first settled in charge of the three parishes of Fairfield, Newfield, New Bridgeport and Westen. A short time before his death he relinquished Bridgeport and confined his labors to Fairfield. Some notes found among the papers of his son, speak of his father as the possessor of a few paternal acres and a homestead where he reared his large family. Part of this landed estate was sold to pay the necessary expenses of the education of two of his sons. Dr. Shelton also writes of his father as follows:

He has left a name in the region of country where he resided renowned for his perfect sincerity of purpose, simplicity of character and undoubted integrity. His devotion to his duty as a Church clergyman was as earnest as it was sincere. He kept an open house of hospitality and was well known for his unaffected generosity. His theology was strictly in conformity with Scripture as explained and illustrated by the Prayer Book. He believed in the Divinely Constituted Church, and the Church in America to be a daughter of the Church in England. He believed in the unbroken succession of that Church through her Priesthood from the Apostles' days and in the spiritual efficacy of the Sacraments.

These doctrines he taught as essential to the well being of the Christian Religion and to those as taught by the followers of Calvin he felt an unqualified repugnance and constantly through his life dissuaded by argument and by exhortation his people from entertaining them. Though passive in the great work of emancipating this country from British rule he was most active in securing for the Church in this land what he deemed the just rights of a free people. By this influence two dissimilar bodies of men were united in a common cause which drove the dominant party from power and which enabled the Church to have certain rights and privileges which had hitherto been denied here. The first fruits of this was the Charter of a College since called Trinity, in

Hartford. He was one of the few among his brethren who decided upon this measure and carried it into effect—and which produced such a change in politics as to have its influence continued to the present.

Rev. Dr. Beardsley in his history tells us he was chosen Secretary to the House of Bishops in 1811. He was the founder of the Church in Bridgeport and for forty years was the continued promoter of its best interests—by the soundness of his doctrine, the zeal of his preaching and the primitive simplicity of his life. He died on the 27th of Feb., 1825. Bishop Brownell said of him, "He has left an example by which all his surviving brethren may profit and which few of them can hope to surpass." The wife of the Rev. Philo Shelton was a woman of marked influence and her son often spoke of her power over him for good. She was a well instructed and devoted Church woman, and after a faithful companionship for nearly a half century, survived her husband thirteen years.

The following letters from Rev. Dr. Jarvis to the Rev. Wm. Shelton also indicate how high his position was, and how nearly he came to be the successor of Bishop Jarvis:

New York, May 18th, 1818.

DEAR SIR:

As I have been lately informed that you will probably be elected to the Episcopate at the meeting in June, I embrace the earliest opportunity to express my hopes that you will in that case do me the favor to accept the robes which were first worn by Bishop Seabury and afterwards by my father. The Seal of the Bishop of Connecticut and its appendages were purchased in London by Bishop Seabury at his private expense and my father when he was consecrated purchased them of the Bishop's family. But it is manifestly improper that a seal of office should be private property. It is my intention therefore to present the seal and vice to the Diocese, and in the event of your election, you will have the goodness to make this intention known to the Convention and to inform me in what manner I shall transmit them to you. I must beg to make my compliments acceptable to Mrs. Shelton and your daughter and to believe me, with great regard,

Rev. and dear Sir,

Your friend and brother,

SAM. F. JARVIS.

The Rev. Wm. Shelton.

New York, June 12, 1818.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:

As the *Nolo Episcopari* is one of the qualifications for the office of a Bishop I am not surprised at your diffidence with regard to your own merits; and however your modesty may underrate them, they are certainly treated more justly by others. I was informed as I stated to

you, and informed by clerical gentlemen whom I consider most competent to give an opinion, that if any election should be made at the Convention (now past) you would undoubtedly be the man. After this assurance I conceived that I was authorized to make the offer I did. It was intended to express as soon as I had an opportunity to do so the very great respect and regard, (I hope you will permit me to add friendship) which I feel for you and yours. My father I know felt toward you every sentiment of kindness and affection and I grew up in the habit of correspondent feelings. I shall soon I hope have the pleasure of seeing you on my way to New Haven and in the meantime with compliments to your good family must beg you to believe me ever

Your affectionate friend and Brother,

Rev. Wm. Shelton.

SAM. F. JARVIS.

The following letter is interesting for the fact that it tells of the primary Conference relating to the College which has become so successful in our day:

Bridgeport, Dec. 19, 1822.

DEAR BROTHER:

I have just returned from New Haven and sit down to give you an account of our meeting of which I presume you are anxious to hear. We all much lamented your absence and the difficulty that caused it. About twenty of the clergy met at the Bishop's. After the usual salutations and a pleasant cup of tea the Bishop opened the business of the meeting by reciting to us the state of the Magazine and the necessity of giving more countenance to the work by exerting our influence to increase the subscriptions and furnishing more original matter for publication and then read your letter until he came to the last clause your sentiments were generally approbated—After discussing this subject—that of founding a College was next brought up, and the previous question was taken, whether it was expedient to have an Episcopal College; an unanimous vote in the affirmative. The next question what shall be the lowest sum for a permanent fund, on which the petition is to be granted? The sum agreed upon was thirty thousand dollars. A committee of six appointed to draw a memorial which is to be put into the hands of every clergyman, and to be signed by all his parishoners if they see cause. Also subscription papers for the fund: With regard to the place of location! The places named Hartford, Middletown and New Haven. Which of the three places to be determined upon by the Trustees when appointed. The Committee named were Bishop Brownell, Mr. Croswell and Mr. Wheaton, with Messrs. Nathan Smith, Seymour and Boardman. Great harmony and unanimity of sentiment pervaded every heart present. After discussing the subjects and finishing the business upon which we were summoned together, we were pleasantly entertained with fruits, raisins, nuts and a glass of wine, and closed our meeting with prayer and retired to our respective lodgings. In the morning the clergy generally returned to their respective families. I tarried and dined with the Bishop and arrived home at day lit dawn, and after a little refreshment thought

proper to give you the above and foregoing narrative. Mr. Baldwin was not present nor Mr. Judd and but one from Litchfield County, viz. Holcomb. \* \* \*

Believe me your sincere friend and Brother,  
To the Rev. Mr. Burhans. PHILO SHELTON.

William Shelton spent his early years under the blessed training of such a father, and from a child was instructed in the Word of God and the cardinal doctrines of the Church. As a lad in his father's home he was much in the society of the most distinguished clergymen and so was early informed upon the leading ecclesiastical events of the day. The desire for the companionship of his "grave and reverend seniors" was a marked peculiarity of his youth. Once when Bishop Hobart was a guest of his father, William was deputed to take the Bishop in the gig to New York. On their way through Marmaroneck plains, a young man was overtaken on the road. The Bishop called halt and warmly greeting the gentleman entered into conversation about some studies and books. After starting on their journey the Bishop said, William, that young man is named DeLancey and is studying under me for the ministry and you mark my word, he will make a name for himself in the Church. The first Bishop of Western New York, fully verified the prophecy. William completed his academical course at Cheshire School and his theological studies in the General Seminary.

While at Cheshire Academy the following letter he received from his father and it is given as showing the influence which was exercised over the son:

SON WILLIAM:

In your letter you express your entire contentment in your studies. When we feel the most secure we are frequently in the greatest danger. Satan may be attacking us in some quarter, that we think not of, thereby throwing us into difficulties past remedy. You are just now emerging into life and it becomes you to be exceeding cautious how you behave and keep yourself clear from the world and from all attachments to any of its allurements. (His father also cautioned his son in this letter to beware of "the secret dart of love" and so strongly reasoned against matrimonial seductions that it is to be feared that it accounts for the lengthy bachelordom of the son. This however was most richly compensated for in the estimable and splendid wife which in his later years he found. This letter concludes with the hope that ) You will return to

the family with all the improvements which we have a reason to expect and what will be more gratifying to us—a character not only unsullied, but with adornings as will do honor to yourself and the name you bear. Let duty alone regulate your conduct and be not hasty of speech nor wanting in civility but be the steady, upright, well-behaved young man and the consequence will be your own happiness.

With due respect I subscribe myself your Father,

PHILO SHELTON.

This dignified epistle shows what was the paternal power which moulded the strong, sedate and manly character in the son. When about nineteen years old William graduated from the academy, and for a short time thereafter taught school at North Hempstead L. I. In the General Seminary it was the day of small things, but his associates were those whose names have been known since in the Church as among her most able and renowned Prelates and Priests. The correspondence which has fortunately been largely preserved, shows a warmth of attachment indicating the truest friendship. Whittingham, Doane, Seabury, Jarvis, Johnson and other like names were the splendid surroundings of the young student and their letters prove them to have been his attached friends.

He was ordained to the Diaconate Aug. 4th, A. D. 1823 and in the same year settled at Plattsburg. From this place he removed to Red Hook where he remained a year. In a letter dated Red Hook, Oct. 31, 1825, the vestry expressed their sorrow at parting from the Pastor and say:

You have been associated with us as our Pastor but twelve months, and in that time attachments have been formed on the part of the Vestry and Congregation that fully convince us of your worth. We approve not only of the manner but the zeal and industry with which you have performed all the duties belonging to your station.

During his diaconate Columbia College conferred on him the degree of A. M.\* In reply to his friend Mr. Gulian P. Verplanck who notified him of the honor, he acknowledges his unmeriting it but declares "it shall be another powerful incentive to rouse the energies of my nature into vigorous action." He remained in Fairfield and was for

\* It ought in justice to Dr. Shelton to be mentioned that he was fully qualified for a collegiate course, but that staunch loyalty to the Church, caused his father to send him to Cheshire, as a Church institution which he felt bound to sustain.



a part of his ministry during the three years there associated with his father. While here he was advanced to the Priesthood by Bishop Brownell, May 17th, A. D. 1826. In the Summer of 1829 he accepted the call to S. Pauls Church Buffalo, which became the scene of his life's work. Travelling by wagon and boat he reached his parish in the early Fall of that year, and preached his first sermon as Rector on Sept, 11th which was his thirty-first birth day. He had previously visited the place in an excursion to Canada, and seemed to be attracted to the new life of the West. The Rev. Addison Searle who preceded him as Rector writes in 1827, "We are gratified to learn that you arrived safely in your snug and quiet home, and that you were pleased with your excursion to these Western wilds; especially that this frontier station—this outpost of the Union, Buffalo, in its rude state seemed so agreeable to you. It is a goodly heritage, but has few pleasures, luxuries or advantages in comparison of the old long settled parts of the country." In this letter Mr. Searle sounds his young friend as to his willingness to succeed him and assures him of a pretty unanimous vote of invitation. He says, "They must have a devout, consistent and enlightened Churchman, and you sir, as far as I know, will be the person should I learn you will be likely to come." In another letter he informs him of his unanimous election, and after having been succeeded by his friend writes of the new Rector's success as heard from through his former parishoners. The literal reproduction of all these early letters would doubtless prove attractive to many but the space of this article forbids it. It is for this reason that we must only hastily sketch his extended Rectorship in Buffalo. When Dr. Shelton came to his parish the city had less than ten thousand in population and was considered a frontier town. In an address delivered by him on an occasion celebrating his 78th birthday he says, "I was at my coming in entire ignorance of Western habits and people. The congregation was composed of persons from various parts of the Nation, chiefly from New England and of those mostly who knew little of the

claims of the Church and were ignorant of her doctrines. It can be readily understood how nice a matter it was to me who was bred in the bosom of the Church, who believed all her doctrines and felt bound to proclaim them. I taught doctrines and inculcated opinions which had never been heard of, and which seemed not only strange but so exclusive as to be illiberal and uncharitable." The earnest Rector in God's Providence was spared to see this opposition to the Church turned to an intelligent adherence to the truth. In these early years his nearest clerical neighbors were the brethren in Canada, and the courteous friendship begun then lasted through his whole life. The lord Bishop of Niagara when present at the fiftieth anniversary of his Rectorship said, "Amongst the many blessings with which a gracious God has surrounded me I count my acquaintance with Dr. Shelton to be among the greatest. It commenced nearly a half century ago and has been interrupted by not a single unpleasantness. He had opportunities of education superior to mine and he was blessed with a strong, vigorous mind and a warm generous heart which whilst it drew me naturally to him caused me to profit greatly by our intercourse." The Bishop also stated at that time what he repeated at the memorial service held on All Saints Day. Namely, "that it was owing to the information and instruction received from Dr. Shelton which led to the publication of a pamphlet by himself concerning the organization of the Church in the Dominion and which resulted in the present ecclesiastical system established." In speaking further of this work in its extent he said, "How much then is he a benefactor who has been instrumental in turning the thoughts of a young friend into a channel which has produced such blessings as have been conferred upon the colonial and Irish branches of the Church of CHRIST by our synodical system copied in great measure for the Church in the United States."

The new Rector in Buffalo soon became a felt power for good in the city and was identified with all the public interests of the growing town. He was chosen the first President of the Young Men's Association in 1835, which

is to-day a most popular and flourishing institution. In 1843 he was married to Mrs. Lucretia Grosvener of Geneva. He called their long married life an uninterrupted blessing. She was indeed a worthy help-meet and her death which preceded his just a year was a blow from which he never recovered.

The imposing Church building which was the Doctor's pride was begun by him in 1848 and was not fully completed until twenty years afterward. It is deservedly called his monument, for it was his indomitable perseverance and untiring energy which pushed it to success. One of the most notable events in his parochial life was the celebration of the fiftieth year of his continued pastorate. Distinguished friends from abroad, with his parishoners and fellow citizens met to do him honor, without distinction in creed or in social condition. The rich and poor offered their greeting and the members of the minister's meeting went in a body to pay their respect to the venerable Priest. Although so staunch a defender of the Faith and so severe in his denunciation of what he believed heresy, he never failed to have the honor and esteem of those who differed from him. Dr. Shelton was a member of the General Convention in 1841 and after an interregnum of some years continued to represent his Diocese until the last session in 1880.

From the beginning of Geneva, now Hobart College, he was a Trustee and warm supporter of the institution. His correspondence shows a laborious interest in its behalf and the letters from Bishop De Lancey indicate the commanding position he held in relation to its affairs. He received his degree of D.D. from this institution. His letters from his Bishop show also the warm friendship between them and his earnest effort to sustain the work of his beloved diocesan.

From a letter from Judge de Veaux it seems the Doctor was the confidant and adviser of the Judge in the original scheme for De Veaux College, and throughout his active ministry he continued to be zealously engaged for its well being.

Nashotah was also a favorite with Dr. Shelton and

the letters from Dr. Breck and the others early associated with the mission, connect him with its beginning as an ardent supporter. His thoughts however continued to dwell about his Alma Mater—the General Seminary and his affection grew stronger with his advancing years. This is not to be wondered at when we read the letters from those who were with him then expressive of their devoted attachment to each other and their Professors. Certainly the value of the work which that school has wrought for the welfare of the Church in this land cannot be over estimated. Every summer the Doctor made a pilgrimage to his ancestral home in Bridgeport for rest and recuperation, and during his last illness he often spoke of going home. He felt he must see the old parsonage again. He was not disappointed for through the kindly care of friends he was enabled to make the journey comfortably, and left Buffalo July 23d, 1883. Here, in the house in which he was born eighty-five years before, he died on the eleventh of October, 1883.

The best word which expresses the character of Dr. Shelton is strength. Robust in body, he was also robust in thought. This strength of character was manifest in all he said and did. It impressed itself upon every person or work with which he was connected. Such a strong man must have made his virtues prominent. It produced an integrity which was unqualified. Every one said, He is an honest man. Such a strong character could not help but show faults as prominently, for he could not under any circumstances be a dissembler. He was essentially a true man. These faults of his temperament are forgotten in the remembrance of the righteousness which filled out his life. He was large hearted and unboundedly generous. Since his death the statements are shown which make him dispense one-third of his entire income in certain years for charity and other pious works. One peculiarity of his temperament was to be easily depressed and discouraged, but the rebound would follow with increased power and hope. He was not very self-dependent but modest and humble-minded. He distrusted his own powers, but when his abilities were de-

manded, discharged his public duties fearlessly and with usual success. His Bishop to whom he was sincerely and tenderly attached (the present diocesan) preached his memorial sermon in the Cathedral Church on the evening of All Saints' Day and chose for his text "Behold now is in this city a man of God and he is an honorable man." No more befitting words as applied to the life and character of the Rev. Dr. Shelton could have been chosen. We wish we had the space for an extended extract from this sermon. The Bishop said, "In my missionary duties going to and fro in the adjoining towns and among acquaintances, every where I heard his name as a house-hold word, \*\*\*\*\* A Shelton in every American town would be salt to the nation." The love of his parishoners was constant and fervent as was his for them, and his dying words were greetings for them. At his death the Vestry took entire charge of his funeral, and receiving his remains on their arrival in Buffalo, placed them in the Church where they lay reverently guarded until the service on Sunday afternoon of Oct. 14. It is estimated that 3,000 persons passed through the aisles of the Church to look once more on the face they had known so long, and it was noticed that the poor made up a large part of the throng.

The Rector and nine of the clergy were present at the burial service which was most solemn. The large choir of men and women united with the surplice choir of men and boys, the latter preceding the funeral procession into the Church. The whole city seemed moved on the occasion and as the cortege moved through the streets many people were gathered on the sidewalks reverently interested in the funeral of this well known father in the Church. The address at the funeral was made by the Rector who is the immediate successor of Dr. Shelton.

JOHN W. BROWN.

## THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES AND THE DECREASE OF THE MINISTRY.

WITHIN the last thirty years two phenomena have shown themselves side by side. Theological Seminaries have been multiplied, and the proportion of candidates for the Ministry has steadily decreased. Is it a case of "Goodwin Sands and Tenterden steeple," or is there the relation of cause and effect between these two things?

Let us first get the facts before us. Last year there were ordained in our Church 109; died, 56; deposed, 10; retired or superannuated (circ.) 15; leaving a net increase of 28. *That is about one Clergyman for every two Dioceses, and nobody for a Missionary.* The same year the number of communicants increased 13,000. That is to say, for every Deacon ordained last year there was waiting somewhere in the Church a congregation of 500 communicants.

There are now in the Church about 300 candidates for Orders, 250 of them are in seminaries. In the General Seminary, 100. In Berkeley Divinity School, 40. At Alexandria, 40. The other 70 are distributed among *fourteen different seminaries.* That is to say, there are, on an average, five students in each school. To teach these seventy students there are engaged, (not counting the Bishops), more than fifty Clergymen. In other words, there is a Professor for every one and one-third students.

The amount of *money invested* in our seminaries is near \$6,000,000. At four per cent, the cost to the Church is, \$1,000 a year for the teaching and lodging of each student. This does not include the revenue from individual gifts for the current expenses of the schools, or the gifts



to the various "societies for the increase of the Ministry" toward the support of the students—two-thirds of whom are aided by the Church's bounty. This then, is the state of the case: there are *nineteen* "Seminaries;" they hold \$6,000,000 of the Church's property; they withdraw *seventy* Priests from the legitimate work of the Ministry to act as "Professors;" they have within their walls 250 students; they do not teach them satisfactorily, and they are growing to have fewer and fewer students to teach. One of them, with comfortable, not to say luxurious accommodation for fifty students has within its walls only five.

It is worse than idle to shut our eyes to the fact that something is seriously wrong.

At the Church Congress in 1881, the question of the education of the Ministry was discussed at length by some of the most thoughtful men in the Church. It was generally assumed that the seminary system had failed in both quantity and quality of teaching. Various ways of bettering it were suggested.

In all their discussions they allowed, as I most heartily do now, that the men who hold the position of instructors are earnest and godly. (I make a point of this, for I have been unfortunate sometimes in gaining the ill will of men while criticizing a system.)

The Rev. Dr. Ewer urged that there should be added to the present curriculum a training in Casuistry, so as to fit for work in the Confessional box which the "Catholic Movement" had made a necessity.

The Rev. President Eliot emphasized the fact that *character* is the great desideratum; that this is evidently independent of any method of technical instruction; and that there was grave danger, if the thing had not been already done, of degrading character by the custom of giving students pecuniary support.

The Rev. Mr. Donald complained that in the system of seminary training, spiritual education, the one thing needful, is practically lost sight of.

The Rev. Mr. Parks charged that the teaching is insufficient and cowardly in that it ignores and shirks whole

domains of questionings which are sure to face the Priest when he begins his work.

The Rev. Dr. Fairbairn stood up for the seminaries in an *ad captandum* argument.

Dr. Shattuck put in a very sensible plea for a due proportion of practical with the theoretical training.

Bishop Elliot spoke some snapping common sense to the purport that pretty much all that is really worth knowing must either be learned after one leaves the seminary, or independent of its teaching while he is in it.

Bishop Paddock vindicated the seminaries as they are, and the system of charitable aid to students as it now exists.

The whole discussion indicated a deep-rooted disaffection at the current method of dealing with the matter of recruiting our Ministry. This, and kindred subjects have occupied a prominent place in the thought of the Church for the last twenty years. It is now very near that stage when a general discussion and a definite action will be imperative.

In 1853, under the leadership of Dr. Muhlenberg, a memorial was submitted to General Convention, begging for action upon three subjects: (1) concerning Liturgical liberty; (2) concerning the training of the Ministry; (3) concerning the reunion of Protestant Christendom. This petition was signed by such names as Drs. Muhlenberg, Harwood, Bedell, Vinton, Howe, Hobart and Coxe. The first of their three prayers only found its answer in the report of the Committee on Liturgical Enrichment to the General Convention of 1883. The second is now the most imperious problem before the Church. There are indications in more than one quarter that the third is looming up.

The heart of the Church is heavy to-day at the pitiful cry of her unemployed Clergy. Her conscience is uneasy in face of the fact that fewer and fewer of her sons seek the Priest's office. Of course explanations without number may be given for this state of things; but the trouble with the explanations is, that they do not explain. The skepticism—the materialism—the secularization of

the age—the open avenues to worldly honors and profit—all these are beside the point. These things have always existed. With these reasons, as such, the Church has nothing to do. When the time comes that they do not exist the millennium will be so well advanced that there will be little need for the ministry of reconciliation. The truth is, that heretofore the applicants for the Ministry have been most numerous and most devoted at those times when the world was most hostile. The Church herself is to blame for the lack. The fault is partly in spirit and partly in method. As to spiritual fault it is unbecoming to speak. Vicious methods however, are fair subjects of criticism. The root-vices of our system of recruiting the Ministry seem to be these two:

(1) *The power to choose candidates is an inherent right of the Episcopate, but has been usurped by the Standing Committee.*

(2) *The rightful place of training for the Priesthood is the Diaconate; but this place has been usurped by the Theological Seminary.*

These two things will bear pondering. There is a legitimate place in the Church for both Seminary and Standing Committee—but not the place they now hold.

I. One of the ugliest things in the Church is the way the Episcopate allows itself to be put upon. It is too ready to accept obeisance instead of obedience. It is content with the shadow and gives up the substance. The Bishop is treated with profound reverence—and disobeyed. Such pranks are not played with the Standing Committee. That grim body is fateful.

Our Church is practically composed of Bishops, Priests and Laymen. The Priests and Laity have joined hands and conduct its affairs. The Bishop has become largely ornamental and the Deacon has vanished.

Nowhere else in the whole Church Catholic has the right of the Bishop to choose out fit persons for the Ministry been questioned, save only in our American Church. Here he has no such power. The Canonical course of procedure in the case of a candidate for Orders, rendered into plain language from Title I of the Digest is this.

When a man thinks of "studying for the Ministry" he is first to consult his Rector. If the Rector thinks well of it he can go to the Bishop. If the Rector does not think well of it, he can go to the Bishop all the same.

Upon his arrival the Bishop is instructed to ask him (1) whether he has ever applied elsewhere; (2) whether he is ready to pass his examinations; (3) where and when he was Baptised, Confirmed and received his first Communion. If he is able to answer all these inquiries satisfactorily, the Bishop is Canonically required—to make a note of this fact. That is all. At this stage the Canon declares that in the absence of a Bishop the Standing Committee can do it all just as well.

But now the real business of the young man commences. Up to this point he has been a "Postulant," occupying a personal relation toward the Bishop which the "practical" Standing Committee neither knows nor cares anything about. The Bishop may know him, and love him, and be fain to ordain him, but that goes for nothing. Now he must "apply to the Standing Committee for recommendation to the Bishop for admission as a candidate." To procure this recommendation he must lay before the Standing Committee a "testimonial" in terms prescribed. This testimonial must be signed by a Rector and Vestry, or by a Presbyter and four Laymen. If he does not bring this testimonial, the Canon is careful to say, the Standing Committee can receive him all the same. With the recommendation of the Standing Committee in his hand the young man goes to the Bishop again. The Canon assumes that the Bishop will obey the godly admonition of the Standing Committee in the premises, for at this point it requires that the Bishop *shall* require the young man to declare whether he intends to become a candidate for Priest's Orders, or for Deacon's only. If the latter, the Bishop may now accept him. If the former, the Bishop may not be trusted. He must inquire for the young man's diploma! If there is any doubt as to its sufficiency the Bishop is advised to submit it to the Standing Committee for consideration. If no diploma is forthcoming the young man

must be turned over to the Examining Chaplains. After all this the Bishop may,—not ordain him, but admit him to be a candidate for ordination at some future time. At this point the young man ordinarily goes to the seminary.

Now in all this process neither Bishop, Rector, nor Congregation have any power. It is practically a matter between the Standing Committee and the man who seeks the Ministry. Of course the Bishop has the right arbitrarily to refuse to receive or ordain. This is a prerogative, however, of no great value at a time when so few candidates apply. His field may be white to the harvest, but he can call no man to his aid without either taking him from some other's field, or else wait the pleasure of the Standing Committee.

Then, worse than all, the very qualities the possession of which makes a man valuable in a chief pastor's eyes are the very qualities which go for nothing in the judgment of the Standing Committee. Devotion is of less value than Greek. Good sense is rated below "soundness." The indispensable qualities for the Ministry cannot be ascertained by the Standing Committee at all. They can only become known to the Bishop in his quality of Chief Pastor. That a mixed committee of Clergy and Laymen, shall be the *only* body possessing the right to pass upon such questions is simply monstrous. The consequence is that at this moment it would literally be easier for a thief to enter our Ministry than for a man that is ignorant of Latin. It would be easier for a forger than for a man known to hold doctrine contrary to the opinions of the Standing Committee. The primitive plan was the best. "Look ye out from among you men of good report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." The choice of the candidate by those who know him is the pledge of his character and of his gifts. His training for the higher Ministry is in the exercise of the lower. When he purchases to himself a good degree it will be given him. Of this only those can judge who are set over him in the

LORD. The Standing Committee is set over him by the General Convention. There is a difference

II. Now, instead of being made a Deacon at this point and set to work to prove his gifts, earning an honest livelihood the while at his desk or by his hammer, he is sent to the Seminary, and supported by the "Education Society." Our own Church and the Presbyterian are the only ones which follow this plan. The Roman Catholics have "Seminaries," to be sure, but they are entirely different things, and for a different purpose from ours. In the English Church, not one Clergyman in fifty has ever seen the inside of a seminary.

I have pointed out the cost, in money and in men of our method. This is the least of its evils. Not but what there is a place for the Divinity Schools—one or two of them. There is. But to maintain a school for exceptional cases and special purposes, is one thing. To make it the ordinary and almost inevitable place of training is quite another thing. An "educated" Clergy is very desirable. But the phrase is a most misleading one. It came into use when the course of training for all educated men was alike; the only difference in the case of the Clergy being that they were carried farther along in it. Now all that is changed. Some of the best educated men in this country, the men whose names stand highest in literature, and art and science, could not pass the preliminary examination of a candidate for Orders. But who will dare say they are uneducated? Who would not rejoice to have such men in our Ministry?

The assumption of the whole Scripture is, that men leave their nets, their professions, their business, their trades, to preach CHRIST's Gospel. With us this is virtually impossible. During the last General Convention one of the most eloquent and devoted of our Bishops made an address in my Church upon Domestic Missions. He closed with an impressive appeal to the men present, by their love of GOD and of their country to consider whether they might not, some of them at any rate, like S. Matthew, leave their counting houses, and become ambassadors of CHRIST. Now suppose one of them had taken



the Bishop at his word. He is a lawyer, a merchant, an engineer, a man of leisure. His standing in the community is high. He has shown by his success in business, his ability to deal with men and affairs. By his offer of himself he shows his devotion. He is forty years old, and has a family which he rules well. The Church is praying, "Lord send forth laborers into thy harvest." Here is a laborer ready. What does the Church say to him? She says: My dear brother, *it will take you five years at the very least to be able to pass the Standing Committee.* That is enough for him—and it ought to be enough. He turns away, and the Church goes again upon her knees and wails in solemn Litany, "LORD send forth laborers into thy harvest." Now set over against this the fact that four hundred Priests who possess precisely the learning in which our friend who turns sadly away is wanting, are "unemployed," and can hardly get their bread.

It is true that our Ministry ought to *have within it* a much more critical knowledge of Greek and Hebrew than it has; but it does not follow that the knowledge should be equally distributed among the Clergy. We need an "educated" and an "uneducated" Clergy. But by what right is the title of "educated" monopolized by those who have learned enough Greek and Hebrew to pass an examination—and then forgotten it?

The crying evil of our system is that it compels us to look for the recruits to our Ministry among boys and not among men. To enter our Ministry, seven years continuous preparation is necessary. That is, if a young man expects to be ordained at twenty-five, he must settle his vocation at eighteen. If the Ministry were simply a "profession," there would be no great harm in this. Other professions have, to a degree, the same exigency. But our office will not stand on that ground. It will be nothing but the devotion of a life to the interests of CHRIST'S Kingdom, and that devotion made after he knows what life is. With us, one must choose the Ministry when he is a boy, or stay out of it when he is a man. The only thing to do for the *man* who feels "woe

is me if I preach not the Gospel," is to become an irresponsible "Evangelist," like Mr. Moody, or a Sunday School Superintendent, or that nondescript thing, a "licensed Lay Reader." A "licensed Lay Reader!" The Church might as well license a man to breathe. To read and entreat is the inherent right of every Christian man which the Church did not give and cannot take away. The wisest of our Bishops have never adopted the habit of licensing "Lay Readers." Suppose a Layman does it without a "license," what is his Bishop or anybody else going to do about it? But the Ministry is closed against him. The "Standing Committee" stands across his path, obstructive, conservative, respectable—with a Canon in position.

We have well nigh lost sight of the true source in which the Priesthood is to be recruited and trained. The *Diaconate* ought to be in numbers, in the ratio of seven to one to the Priesthood. To-day we have 67 Bishops, 3,421 Priests and 142 Deacons. That is two Deacons and a third for each Diocese! These are only Deacons *en passant*. Most of them applied for Priests Orders originally, and simply "tarry in Jericho till their beards be grown." We have no Diaconate. As in Rome, the Pope has swallowed up the Bishops, so with us the Seminary and the Standing Committee between them have made away with the Deacon. We could have them by the hundred. In each one of a thousand Parishes there are two or three men at least, who, if they were ordained, could do well the precise work for which Deacons are intended. They could, and they would, be willing to superintend Sunday Schools. They would hold services and teach in outlying portions of the Parish. They would look after the poor and pray with the sick. In the absence of the Rector, they would conduct service in the Church or Chapel. They would be a connecting link and band of union between Priest and People. They would set free the Rector to give himself to the Word. If any among them show inclination and fitness for a high office the Priest will have sufficient acquaintance with them to advise them well, and sufficient

time to instruct them. He can at any rate instruct them so far that one year in the seminary will be sufficient instead of three. This would largely render unnecessary that most dangerous of necessary evils, charitable aid to students for the Ministry. This is a delicate subject to touch, but none will question this much; that, while an honorable man, may, without shame, take aid from a brother who knows him, and to whom he can feel gratitude, yet he cannot, without danger, be supported by a society to which he neither can nor does feel grateful. In the former case he will relieve himself from the debt as soon as he can. In the other case he will get as much as he can, and pay it back as late as he can. As a Deacon in a Parish he would not want, and the gifts would not injure him. As a student in a distant seminary it is, to put it mildly, doubtful. None will deny that "learning" costs too much if it be secured at the risk of manliness.

What is to hinder? The Standing Committee. The system we have fallen into is familiar. It is entrenched. It is "safe." It seems to secure a "learned" Clergy. But when it shall be discovered that this institutional training does not insure an efficient pulpit or a wise pastorate; that it is too costly; that it shuts the door of the Ministry in the faces of men whom we would thankfully see at our Altars—then the Episcopate may pluck up courage and demand of the Standing Committee its usurped rights, and the Church be willing to exchange seventeen of our nineteen seminaries for at least seventeen Deacons.

S. D. Mc CONNELL.

## THE PROPOSED PRAYER BOOK IN THE CONVENTION OF 1886.

ONE hardly likes to break a lance with so good a Churchman and so excellent a lawyer as Mr. Nash; yet even the good Homer sometimes nods, and it is conceivable that Mr. Nash may be mistaken. Indeed we think he is, and we propose to say briefly why we think so.

Mr. Nash, in his thoughtful article on the duties of the General Convention in relation to the Prayer Book, raised the question whether an amendment adopted by one General Convention must be ratified or rejected without alteration by another, or whether the second Convention has authority to alter it. He thinks that it has. We do not. The words of the Constitution appear to us to be plain and positive. "No alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention and adopted at the subsequent General Convention." The learned gentleman, whose words are well worthy of respectful consideration, thinks that this direction is sufficiently complied with by "the substantial concurrence of two successive Conventions in the authorization of them," *i. e.*, proposed changes in the Prayer Book. We regret very much that we are not able to agree with him. We apprehend that he has been misled by allowing himself to use the word "substantial". We may be dull, but we confess that the meaning of this word is not very clear to our mind. It seems to us that a "substantial concurrence" may be an agreement in the thought but not in the words of a proposition; or it may be an agreement in only such parts of it as may be believed to be material. The word "substantial," certainly

does not occur in the Constitution and we are unable to find any thought which warrants the employment of it. On the contrary it seems to us that the Constitution requires an absolute concurrence. The alteration or addition which is adopted in the second General Convention must be "the same" that was proposed in the first. It must be actually identical with it, not merely like it; but substantial agreement can produce only resemblance and not identity. The learned gentleman may be right, though we can see no reason to think that he is. We may be allowed to express our regret that he has not supported his proposition by reasoning or evidence, but has confined himself to illustrations. His illustrations, however, do not strike us as very happy. They seem to illustrate the convenience rather than the correctness of his view; and we must confess that they have not removed from our mind the impression that the wisest course for the General Convention to pursue will be to adhere to the letter of its Constitution.

To give an illustration of substantial concurrence, imaginary indeed, but, upon the whole, as instructive as that of Mr. Nash. We will suppose that the trustees of a college, wishing to practice economy, and to lay up a little money, but apparently having grave doubts of their power to control their inclinations to extravagance, pass a self-denying ordinance, by which, after settling a schedule of expenses they bind themselves not to adopt any resolution involving further expenditure until it should have been passed at two meetings of their board. Under this wise rule the college prospers and grows rich. We can further imagine this college after it had made every possible provision for the enrichment of the minds of its students taking thought for the wants of their bodies. The trustees accordingly pass a resolution to establish a lunch room, and appropriate, we will say, \$500 to fit it up. At the second meeting, however, it is found that this sum is inadequate, and the resolution is amended by substituting \$1,000. Here is undoubtedly substantial concurrence. Every body is agreed that a lunch room is a very good and necessary thing, and that it

must be paid for. The precise amount to be paid is a very trifling consideration. Nevertheless, we fear that the treasurer, when the bills come in, will, in the most hard-hearted manner refuse to pay them, upon the ground that the resolutions are not the same, but entirely different ones, and that one of them must be adopted at a subsequent meeting, and the other rejected. The simple truth is that "substantial concurrence" is so vague and shadowy a thing that the less any one has to do with it the better. There are, besides, real and serious dangers connected with it. If the General Convention follows the plain directions of its Constitution, and adopts or rejects, without debate, if possible, but certainly without alteration, some or all of the amendments to the Prayer Book which it approved at its last meeting, it will undoubtedly be acting within its powers, and everybody will accept its work. If, however, it proceed to revise and alter them, it will be assuming a power which is at the best doubtful, and it is by no means certain that the Church will approve its action. For it should be borne in mind that the General Convention is not like a legislature which can enforce its orders by pains and penalties. Its acts, like those of a council, must rest ultimately upon the consent of the Church, *i.e.*, the whole body of Bishops, Priests and Laity; and if they disapprove of them they will not accept them, and cannot be forced to do so. That this is no imaginary danger may be shown by a couple of illustrations. When the General Convention attempted to make the use of a hymnal compulsory, it was immediately pointed out that the right of setting forth hymns was not one of the powers that were given to it in the 8th or any other Article of its Constitution, and that it had theretofore recognized that fact, by carefully abstaining from doing more than approving of a certain collection of hymns. The consequence of this attempt to exercise a power which was, to say the least, doubtful, has been that, notwithstanding the persevering attempts that have been made to force a hymnal upon the Church, it has not been found possible, in thirteen years to bring it into universal use. Before the Canon



of Marriage and Divorce was passed we had a clear and definite guide to the mind of the Church upon those subjects. The Marriage Service absolutely forbids divorce under any circumstances whatever; the Canon seems to recognize it. The Prayer Book says that man may not put asunder those whom God has joined together; the Canon says that he may. Of course they contradict each other. The consequence is that the more careful Clergy and Laity, obey the Prayer Book and disregard the Canon. The further consequence is that the Convention, if it exceed its powers, does run the risk of bringing itself into contempt; even the acts of a General Council have no authority until they are accepted by the Church; and it is hardly to be expected that the Church will allow a Convention, which is its servant and not its master, to assume powers that have not been intrusted to it, or about which there can be the slightest doubt.

While we are ready to admit, with Mr. Nash, that there may be a great and reasonable desire for the improvement of the Prayer Book, we do not think that the work of the last General Convention ought to be received as final, even if it were possible to remove its blemishes and imperfections. Some of these are of a character that it is impossible to remove.

We do not wish to criticise the proposed alterations and additions, but only to make good our words that they are not a finished work; we may, perhaps, be permitted to point out two or three mistakes or omissions. There can be no excuse for the proposal to substitute other anthems for the *Venite* on any day but Easter. A provincial Church has no right to abandon universal usages. On Easter day, indeed, the fullness of joy has come and there can be no words to greet the King, except "CHRIST is Risen;" but every other day is a looking forward to that Resurrection, and the wisdom of the universal Church has from the very beginning daily adored CHRIST in those wonderful words of His father David. It is true that the *Venite*, in the *bald* form in which it is sung in the English Church, without invitatories, and still more in the mutilated form in which we have it, loses

very much of its force and beauty, but the remedy is easy. It is simply to restore the invitatories. This will make it evident at once how capable the *Venite* is of adapting itself to the varying seasons of the year. The rubric shortening Morning Prayer is defective. It would be far better to sweep away everything before the LORD's Prayer and to begin "In the Name, etc.," but if this cannot be done, provision should be made for omitting all before the LORD's Prayer and after the third collect, including the Litany, whenever the Holy Communion is to follow Morning Prayer. This is a necessity which is felt more and more every day. The old tradition of the English Church is reviving, and men are learning that the real Sunday Service is Morning Prayer and Holy Communion. We would go further, and would recommend the omission of the Commandments and Summary with its Collect, whenever the Communion Service follows Morning Prayer, and the substitution for them of the Introit and the *Kyrie Eleison*, the latter of course in Greek, according to the general usage of the Western Churches. The crying want of the present day is a manageable Sunday Morning service. People now-a-days resort to all sorts of expedients to obtain one. Some are commendable, but some are the reverse. Perhaps the very *worst* of all is the singing the Litany as an introduction to the Communion Service. Indeed if the use of the Litany on Sundays were abolished altogether it would be a great gain.

We will also mention a proposal which appears to us to be singularly useless, we mean the rubric which it is proposed to add at the end of the Communion Service directing that there shall always be two or three to communicate with the Priest. This is a modification of three rubrics in the English Prayer Book which depend upon each other. It is hardly worth while to quote the precise words, but the directions are that all who intend to communicate shall give previous notice to the Priest, and that, unless three persons give such notice, he shall end the service with the prayer for the Church Militant. There is no reason to think that these rubrics were ever

observed. In point of fact, they were found to be impracticable and have long been obsolete. The first and last were removed from our own Book, to the great comfort of Clergy and Laity. We are unable to see any object in restoring the last without the first, and we are confident that it would be a dead letter, simply because the Priest would have no means of knowing before-hand who, or how many, intend to communicate. As matters stand, it is usual for the Priest, if there be two people beside himself in Church, to begin and of course to finish the service. The revival of this obsolete rubric could not change this custom, and would be simply useless for any purpose whatever.

We think that we have said enough to show that the proposed revision is not a finished work, and we do honestly think that the wisest course will be to review it, as Mr. Nash proposes, in the next General Convention, but not to take final action for at least three years more. Let the subject be studied for the next three years; let the grace of God work in men's hearts, and in all probability, they will desire in 1886 something far better than is offered to them now. In the meanwhile let us wait in patience. Six years are but a little while in the life of CHRIST'S Church.

For our own part, we have not taken much interest in the idea of revision; for, like most "Ritualists," as it pleases some of our friends to call us, we have never had any difficulty about teaching, and, to the best of our ability, practising the true Christian Religion with the help of the present Book. In fact the present Prayer Book has never had a fair chance and has never been used in its entirety. It contains more than has ever been brought out of it, for which we are indebted to the time of Edward the VI, and to the imperfectly instructed revisors of the last century, but altogether it is an admirable Book. We are willing, however, to encourage and approve the work of revision. We only ask that it may be deliberate and intelligent.

BEVERLEY R. BETTS.

## SAINT ELIZABETH OF HUNGARY.

“Once I sat on a crimson throne,  
And I held the world in fee;  
Below me I heard my brother's moan;—  
And bent me down to see.  
Lovingly bent and looked on them,  
But I had no inward pain;  
I sat in the heart of my ruby gem,  
Like a rainbow without the rain.  
My throne is vanished; helpless I lie  
At the foot of its broken stair:  
And the sorrows of all humanity  
Through my heart make a thoroughfare.”

**I**N this cold, critical century of unbelief, it is almost impossible for us to understand the spirit of the Middle Ages. We read of the wonderful self denial, of the great religious enthusiasm, and of that remarkable benevolence, which scorned not to minister to the lowest and most repugnant of God's creatures; we read of a singleness of faith, that could interpret literally all the precepts of the Gospel, and that could inspire one to abandon luxury and ease, wealth and plenty, and live, severed from earthly ties of affection, a life full of peace, prayer and good deeds. We read of a zeal for CHRIST's honor that prompted thousands to encounter sufferings, famine and death, in order to rescue from the profanation of the infidels, His Holy Sepulchre, which they deemed so sacred. We hear of these things and smile, and murmur, “misguided zeal, misdirected faith, pitiable fanaticism, precepts misunderstood:” and then, compare our regulated charities, our orderly enterprises, our calm and collected reasoning powers, with the wild enthusiasm and the heroic love of the people of mediaeval times,

and place our attainments far above theirs. It is true that the Church has indeed made progress in the centuries that have elapsed between their age and ours; yet that grand spirit of self-denial and self-abnegation, that mighty spirit of benevolence she seems in a measure to have lost. The Middle Ages required the zeal, power, and fanaticism they possessed, and our nineteenth century, we say, needs not such demonstrative careers; but, truly, it does need more of the simple faith, more of the loving charity, and more of the spirit of self-denial, which marked such characters as Francis of Assisi, Margaret of Scotland, Elizabeth of Hungary, and scores of others whose impressive lives are indeed worthy of emulation. Francis of Assisi was said to be mad, Savonarola to be deranged by success and flattery, and Elizabeth of Hungary to be demented because she lavished her wealth upon the poor; but they cared not for the imputation, since the same harsh judgment fell upon their Master, to whom the Jews said, "Thou hast a devil."

For the requirements of each age GOD raises up such men and women as are needed for instruments in his all-wise plans, and when they have fulfilled His will, they pass away, and others of a different type come forth to carry into effect new purposes. Therefore we cannot say, the Christians now are intrinsically better than those of other ages, only that they are different.

The career of Elizabeth of Hungary was but a brief one, yet it contained the perfection of earthly happiness, and the greatest suffering and destitution which we can imagine. In less than twenty-five years she was a happy bride, a beloved queen, and a joyful mother; then a broken hearted widow, a beggar driven forth from her own palace into the streets with four helpless children; after that, a few years of self-denial and toil for God's poor were granted; then death came to end her short life; and thus in less than a quarter of a century, she had experienced all that life can offer of joy and grief, and was at rest. One cannot be ignorant of Elizabeth's failings, though they all leaned to virtue's side, and were

only the errors of a too smypathetic and loving heart, errors which are seldom met with in these days. Yet, all her bounty to the poor, though perhaps unwise, never really injured her husband's kingdom, but was, as he always thought, a great source of blessings to the people of his realm. The life of Elizabeth is historically true; and, though it reads like a romance, the facts can all be relied upon, and are easily distinguished from the fanciful legends which an imaginative people wove around her saintly deeds, some of which, as the "Legend of the Roses," are told and believed by the Protestants of that country to-day.

In the early part of the thirteenth century, Herman, the Landgrave of Thuringia and Count of Saxony, was advised by a necromancer, Klingsohr by name, to demand of Andrew II., king of Hungary, his little daughter Elizabeth, as a wife for his son Lewis. Pleased with this counsel, Herman sent an embassy of lords and ladies, bearing rich gifts, to the Hungarian Court, to present the request in behalf of his son. Among them was the noted Bertha of Beindeleben and Lord Varila. They were received with honor, and the request being granted, three days were spent in feasting and merry-making; then the beautiful child of four years, clad in a robe richly embroidered in gold and silver, was brought, in an elegant cradle of solid gold, and given to Lord Varila, to whom her father said, "I confide her to your knightly honor." The lord accepted the trust, and never was anything but friendly to the little princess. Andrew sent rare presents, which he had obtained from Constantinople, to the Landgrave of Thuringia. To Elizabeth he gave the rich cradle, a bath, twelve maidens, and provided an income for her, suitable for the daughter of a king. Then the train of knights and ladies set forth on their journey homeward.

Upon reaching Herman's Court the little princess was solemnly betrothed to Lewis, who was then eleven, and they were brought up together as brother and sister, such being the custom of the age. They grew in per-



fect love and devotion to each other, deeming even a short separation a great trial.

From her earliest years Elizabeth manifested great sympathy for the poor; spending her own income when but a mere child, for their wants. She even went to the pantries and kitchens of the royal household and begged broken food to supply the needs of the hungry, until the little princess was looked upon as a nuisance by the cooks and maids of the culinary department. Herman, her future father-in-law, loved her tenderly, but his wife Sophia and the princess Agnes despised Elizabeth, and reproached her for loving her Hungarian maid and condemned her for her rare piety. While Prince Herman lived they were obliged to keep their jealous feelings under restraint, but after his death, which occurred when Elizabeth was nine, they gave full vent to the animosity they had been obliged to hold in check. They treated her with such undisguised contempt that even the servants began to look upon her as an interloper, unworthy of respect. So among all the people of the Court, the princess had but two friends, Lewis her betrothed, and Lord Varila. Her young lover was now really Sovereign, but, not having reached an age where he could have full power, the government was for the present in other hands. Unmoved by the insinuations of his mother, sister and courtiers against his betrothed, he ever remained true to his love for her, and firmly resolved to marry her as soon as possible. Whenever he was obliged to be absent from the Court, he always brought a token of his love home to Elizabeth; sometimes a cross, or purse, a rare string of beads, or a piece of choice jewelry; whatever it was, she received it with joy, and the young man would hold the little girl in his arms and tell her of his tender love for her. Still her enemies insisted that the young man would never marry her, and some even taunted her to the face in regard to it. One day Lord Varila fearing that Lewis might renounce his bride, found opportunity to confer with him alone upon the subject thus: "May it please you to answer a question I shall put to you?"

Having received permission to speak, he continued :  
"Do you mean to marry the Lady Elizabeth I brought to you, or will you send her back to her father?" Pointing towards a mountain that rose before them, Lewis replied : "Seest thou this hill before us? If it was of pure gold from the base to the summit, and if the whole of it should belong to me on the condition of sending back mine Elizabeth, I would never do it. Let the world think and say of her what it likes ; I say this, I love her, and I love nothing more. I will have mine Elizabeth."

These words when repeated to the little maiden, gave her great happiness.

In 1218 when Lewis had attained his nineteenth year he was dubbed knight, and the following year he was married to Elizabeth who was then thirteen years of age. The wedding was celebrated with great splendor, and the festivities lasted for days. The young couple were remarkable for their beauty. Lewis was of splendid physique, with long fair hair and brilliant complexion. Elizabeth, though but a child, was tall, with raven black hair, a clear dark complexion, and graceful and pleasing manners. They were radiantly happy in their love for each other. So holy were their lives that "Angels abode with them." Their piety did not suffer by their devotion, for each stimulated the other to stronger faith and nobler deeds. Lewis was a man of great piety, and loved to converse with monks, and sought the society of good and religious men. His love for the poor, though kept within the bounds of moderation, was equal to that of his wife, and while sympathetic and gentle, he was at the same time full of knightly prowess and valor. The austerities and self-imposed penances of Elizabeth were severe, yet outwardly she was gay and girlish. She appeared in costly dress at the public festivities, and danced, played and sung with the other ladies, for she saw no harm in such innocent amusements, since her heart was really placed on higher and better things. Once when richly attired, with a crown of gold upon her head, she went into the Church at Eismach ; but when

she knelt down and raised her eyes to the large crucifix, and saw the tender gaze of her Master fixed upon her, from beneath the crown of thorns, the contrast between His sufferings and her own gay attire was so apparent, that she fainted away, overcome by devout emotion. From that time she avoided rich attire, never appearing in it, except when necessity compelled her, or her husband required it. Elizabeth's love for her husband was so great that she accompanied him on all journeys when she was permitted to do so, regardless of inclement weather or any other hardship. When obliged to remain at home she dressed in deep mourning, and lived in retirement until his return. Extravagant as was her love for him it did not exceed his devotion to her. While others remonstrated with him upon the lavish bounty of his young wife, he only smiled, and deemed no favor she asked too great to be granted. Her devotion to the poor increased as she grew older, and she gave away all the money she could obtain, and even sold her rich dresses and mantle to procure more. Lepers whom all shunned but the truly devout, were her especial charge, and she ministered to them with her own hands. A legend relates that once finding a leprous child whom none would care for, she bathed it herself and laid it in her own bed. Her husband was amazed upon hearing of it and hastened to her room to remonstate, but as he gazed upon the child, he beheld only a sweet babe, and as he still looked it vanished from his sight. Then he knew it was the Christ-child, for He said:

"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my little ones, ye have done it unto me."

When Lewis found how she really longed to assist the lepers, he allowed her to build a hospital for them at the foot of the hill where the Castle of Wartburg was situated, and thus many poor outcasts were cared for.

In the year 1226 Lewis was obliged to go to Italy with the Emperor Frederick II., and while absent a famine arose in Germany, and was particularly severe in Thuringia. The poor suffered intensely, dying by hundreds in the streets. The treasury contained over sixty thousand

florins, and all this Elizabeth distributed among the needy; she opened the granaries of the State and donated the corn and wheat, and ordered loaves of bread to be baked every day and given to those who came for them. When Lewis heard of the suffering in his domain he obtained permission to return home. As he entered Wartburg, the officers met him and complained of his wife's prodigality, hoping that he would be indignant at her lavish expenditure. But displeased with murmurs, he exclaimed: "Is my dear wife well? What care I about the rest? Alms will never ruin us."

Their meeting was joyful after so long a separation, and Lewis uttered no word of complaint to the young girl, but only asked how the poor had fared in his absence, and she made the memorable answer: "See, I have given to God what was His, and He has preserved to us what was thine and mine."

A most happy married life had been granted to Elizabeth and Lewis for seven years; no quarrel had ever molested their peace; three beautiful children brightened their domestic life, and in the little Herman, not then four years old, they saw the future Landgrave of Thuringia and Hesse. To Elizabeth no cloud dimmed the horizon of their joy, for to her bright anticipations there lay an unbroken vista of years of happiness as wife and mother. But how different to these bright hopes would the stern reality of the future be!

In the eleventh century the world had been fired by the enthusiasm of Peter the Hermit; since then there had been several Crusades led forth to rescue the Holy Sepulchre, and still another was planned for the year 1227. Devout a Christian as Lewis was, he felt that he was called upon to do his share in the Holy War; thus, without the knowledge of his wife, he took the *Red Cross*, and so vowed to enter the lists. He dared not tell Elizabeth of the long separation in prospect for them; but one evening as they sat together, she opened a bag which he wore suspended from a belt, and took out the fatal badge; her feelings overcame her and she fainted away. When she recovered she entreated him

to stay with her if it were possible, but when he plainly showed her that it was a solemn vow which he had made, and that it must be fulfilled, she, too, saw the necessity and gave him up to God. Elizabeth went with him on his journey as far as she was able, going even two days' march beyond her own dominions. At length the kind Lord Varila said that it was best for her to return, and she and her beloved Lewis parted with each other for this life. She returned sad and lonely to her castle, and clothed herself in the garb of mourning, while a fearful presentiment forced its way into her heart. Soon after this Lewis died in Calabria, in the arms of the Patriarch of Jerusalem. This fact was kept from Elizabeth until her fourth babe was old enough, for her to hear the sad news. Tenderly did the once cruel Sophia try to break the news to her son's wife finally saying :

"Oh! my dear daughter, be patient and take this ring which he has sent you; for, to our woe, he is dead."

"Madam," cried Elizabeth, springing up, "what do you say?" Sophia repeated the ominous words. "Oh! LORD, my GOD! LORD my GOD!" exclaimed Elizabeth, "Behold the world is dead for me; the world and all its pleasures."

She flew frantically from room to room, and from one corridor to another moaning and weeping. In vain the ladies of the Court tried to comfort her, but she cried aloud: "I have lost all. O, my beloved brother! O, the friend of my heart, thou hast died and left me in misery. Ah! poor lonely widow that I am; may He who forsakes not widows and orphans comfort me. O, my JESUS, support me in my weakness."

Lewis had been more than a husband to Elizabeth; he was the friend of her childhood, a brother and lover at the same time; and as some has said, "She loved him with all the tenderness of a saint, and all the weakness of a woman." Her soul was knit with his, and his death was like the severing of one heart. But this was not all that was in store for her. Her friend and counselor Lord Varila, who had promised Lewis to protect his wife and children even with his life, was journeying slowly

homeward with the precious remains, and so she had no one to defend her. Her brothers-in-law ordered her to leave the Castle, and no entreaties of Sophia even, could ameliorate the harsh sentence. On a cold day in mid-winter, Elizabeth was turned out of her own mansion, accompanied only by two maids. In her arms she carried her young infant, and the other three children followed, the oldest only four, in the charge of the two servants. It was a pitiful sight. She, a Princess, who befriended all, was now without a friend; alone a widow in the heartless world. Not a door was opened to her, for the cruel Conrad and Henry forbade any to receive her. It is said that the poor whom she had helped even came out and mocked her. Upon reaching an inn she refused to proceed, saying that was free to all. But the landlord dared only assign her a shelter under the roof of his stable. Some friend offered to take charge of the children, and she and her maids tried to earn a living by spinning wool. As soon as her own relatives heard of her distress they offered help immediately, and she went first to a Convent where her aunt was the Superior. Then an uncle, Bishop and Prince of Bamberg, gave her a home at the Castle of Botterstein, where she once more gathered her children around her. As she was still so young, not yet being twenty, her uncle desired her to marry Frederick the Emperor, who was eager to obtain her hand; but Elizabeth had loved too sincerely ever to desire a husband in the place of Lewis, and so declined the royal offer, and laying her wedding dress upon the altar she proclaimed her vow which she had voluntarily made to Lewis, never to marry should he chance to die first. While at Botterstein the retainers passed through with the remains of her idolized husband. The casket was opened, and as she gazed upon the precious form, she prayed thus:

"I give Thee thanks, O Lord, for having granted my wish of beholding again the remains of my beloved, who was also Thine. He had offered himself, and I had offered him to Thee. I regret it not, even though I loved him with all the might of my heart. Thou knowest that



I would have been glad to beg with him from door to door, merely for the pleasure of being with him, if Thou had'st permitted. But now I would not if I could, purchase back his life with one hair of my head, unless it were thy will, O, my God."

Lord Varila was indignant at the treatment Elizabeth had received, and soon brought about a different arrangement of affairs. The rights of little Herman were recognized, and Conrad only reigned until the prince became of age. The town of Marburg with its revenues was given to Elizabeth as her right. Immediately upon establishing herself she founded a hospital, and devoted her income wholly to the support of the poor; for her own living she spun fine wool, for which she could readily find a market. Her life here in Marburg was one of great self-denial and holiness; yet one cannot but regret that she gave herself up so wholly to the direction of her Priest Conrad. It is true that in many instances his commands were salutary; he put a stop to her harsh physical penances, and forbade her to give away but one farthing at a time. Though harsh and stern to his fair penitent, he had stood between her and many enemies, and doubtless shielded her from many insults. When twenty-four a fever seized the saintly Elizabeth, and in a few days the fatal work was completed. During her illness she sung sweet hymns and died radiantly happy. The last word she uttered was "silence," as if she wished those around her to listen to the Celestial strains which already sounded in her ears. Hundreds crowded around the body of the deceased, to praise her deeds and extol her virtues, waiting not for any Ecclesiastical decree to proclaim her Saint. The noble Emperor whom she had declined to marry, placed on her brow a circlet of gold, saying, "Since I could not crown her living as my Empress, I will at least crown her to-day as an immortal Queen in the Kingdom of Heaven.

The old Castle of Wartburg lies in ruins; and the hospitals of her founding have passed away, or bear the names of others; but the little fountain of spring-water where her Leper's Home once stood, still remains, a

simple monument for one who had lived wholly for others. But her deeds are engraven on an immortal record, and the pure waters as they flow into the stone basin, are symbolical of the purity of her saintly life.

CAROLINE F. LITTLE.

## PREACHING WITHOUT NOTES.

NO one who rightly estimates the power of public speaking, especially in this country, can under-rate preaching as one of the functions of the Christian Ministry. A Clergyman is a public speaker—he is a preacher, though he is something more.

If, in his office as a preacher, he faithfully fulfills the trust committed to him by the Church, when she says, "Take thou authority to preach the word of GOD," he will exert a tremendous influence for good.

Every thoughtful Clergyman will often propound to himself the question: How can I perform to the best of my ability this part of my duty as a minister of CHRIST and a steward of the mysteries of GOD?

I do not undertake to give an answer to that question that is absolutely and exclusively true. But I shall aim to point out, especially to the younger Clergy, one way of preaching, that most men may pursue sometimes, and some men altogether, with profit to themselves and their congregations.

I have called it *preaching without notes*. By this I mean preaching, after proper preparation, without a written sermon before the eye or in the memory.

This definition excludes *memoriter* preaching as well as the reading of sermons; neither of which do I condemn, but simply leave them out of this discussion.

*I maintain, that the habit of preaching without manuscript—due study being understood—is useful to the clergyman who adopts it.*

It gives him a sort of mental training that is valuable. The memory is developed. It is gradually so disci-

plined that it readily recalls the train of thought that has been worked out before-hand, and supplies the speaker with appropriate phrases, illustrations and other materials for the sermon, while he is addressing the audience, that he has gathered, here and there, in all the past years of study, reading and observation. Many a practiced public speaker with his audience before him, remembers many things of value that he would never recall under any other circumstances. That the mind may easily remember what has been previously presented to it, attention must be practiced. So, closeness of observation and concentration of thought are cultivated by the man who must draw suddenly on his mental stores for what he says in public.

But even the best trained mind can not well reproduce an illogical discourse—one without order or arrangement.

The logical faculty must therefore be developed and sermons must be prepared with a proper consecution of ideas, with something like a rational organism, or the preacher will find it almost impossible to dispense with the manuscript.

The *act* of speaking without the exact form of expression before the eye or in the memory is a most complicated and difficult process. It comprehends rapid thinking, ready arrangement of the thoughts, quick command of language, proper control over the emotions, power to seize upon any unexpected circumstance and use it, thorough self-command in the presence of an audience that would naturally perturb the calmest mind.

The general on the field of battle, executing the plan that he has formed and modifying it as circumstances require, thinking and acting with celerity, promptness and courage, is hardly a more wonderful spectacle than the well-equipped, thoroughly skilled public speaker, who, without a note to guide him, marshals his forces and brings them to bear upon his audience, interesting, convincing and moving them at will. Preparation for such an effort and the effort itself make a man larger and stronger in the qualities of manhood. Other things be-

ing equal, the clergyman who possesses these qualities in the highest degree will do his work the best. Hence, an inestimable advantage of preaching without notes is seen in the culture that it gives the preacher.

*Its advantage with reference to the audience lies in its effectiveness.* It commands and holds the attention, reaches the understanding directly and affects the sensibilities as no other sort of preaching can do.

The direct look of the speaker into the uplifted faces of the hearers, the natural tones of the voice and expressions of the countenance, the simple, unconstrained manner and the unstudied language, better suited to the ear than a more labored and artificial style, all serve to take hold upon the mind.

Add to these elements of effectiveness the free play of the speaker's emotions, expressing themselves aptly, and we see some of the advantages possessed by this method of preaching.

But there is something behind all these readily recognized forces in the discourse delivered without aid of manuscript that helps to account for its power.

The speaker is thrown into sympathy with his hearers, and that sympathy unconsciously affects his thoughts, so that the audience shapes the course of speech as the banks determine the direction and the form of the flowing stream. Hence, while he reproduces what he has thought out before, it assumes a form impressed upon it by the occasion and best fitted to affect those for whom it is intended.

It may lose in exactness and elegance, but it gains in effectiveness.

This explains, what few have failed to notice, that a speech or sermon that reads well does not sound so well when heard, and one that impresses in delivery, if exactly reported, disappoints the reader who has previously heard it.

It is this immense superiority of the unwritten discourse in holding the attention and persuading the hearer that has made it almost universal amongst public speakers, whose object is to carry their audience with them, the

lawyer, the legislator, the stump-speaker and the preacher.

The clergy of the English Church and of our own Church stand almost alone in their habit of reading sermons. We appreciate the advantages of their method; ability to exhibit learning, exactness of style and statement and that artistic finish which a cultured mind finds it hard to sacrifice. Whether it is better always to enjoy these excellences at the expense of effectiveness, or even sometimes to take one and then the other, each one must decide for himself, and thus determine whether he will adopt the habit of preaching exclusively with or without manuscript, or sometimes use one method and then the other. There are three ways of speaking without manuscript, which may be mentioned and considered.

One might be called the purely extemporaneous. Those who use this method make as little previous preparation in the form of discourse as possible. The argument is made out in the mind, the general course of the work to be done is anticipated, in some cases the illustrations are selected, but no sentences or phrases are formed, and a mere syllabus of the sermon or speech is written for the speaker's guidance. His work before preaching is somewhat like that of a civil engineer, making a survey for a railroad, who runs his line, sketches his plan and marks off the course, but leaves the actual construction of the road for some future time.

Such a speaker thinks over his subject, traces out his course of thought and puts down on paper an outline of the sermon, but leaves the filling up to the occasion of delivery.

This is a very popular method out of the pulpit, and is also adopted by not a few preachers. It may be safely and successfully used by a preacher of well trained, amply stored mind, but I doubt whether it ought to be exclusively followed by many Clergymen.

Without writing, almost any speaker will fall into very loose habits of composition, will insensibly indulge in forms of expression that are commonplace and inappropriate in the pulpit, and worse still, will neglect that careful and patient thinking that is essential to make him an



interesting and edifying teacher. Dr. Storrs, who is an able champion of the extemporaneous method of preaching, as he is an excellent exponent of it in practice, concedes all this, but advises the free and frequent use of the pen to prevent the evils mentioned—its use in writing for the press. The trouble is, that few clergymen, hard worked as they generally are, have the time or the disposition to do any writing that is not required for immediate preparation for Sunday duty. If they write no sermons, they will write nothing.

I should say, if one sermon a week is thoroughly prepared, elaborately written, that a second one might safely be made and delivered in the style now under discussion. Then, the written sermon will impart some of its exactness and finish to the unwritten, and take from it some of the life and spirit that it needs. Thus, too, the preacher would form and persist in habits of study that would save him from indolent neglect of preparation for his pulpit ministrations. Another method of speaking without manuscript is that in which the whole speech or sermon is thought out in detail, without the use of the pen; introduction, argument, propositions, illustrations, many phrases and paragraphs are written upon the mind and reproduced in speaking just as they were arranged in previous study. Of course gaps are left to be filled up, but numerous passages that are intended to be impressive are as exactly framed and delivered as if they were written before-hand and memorized with the aid of the eye.

This mode of speaking has been extensively employed by distinguished orators and with extraordinary results.

Though it partakes of the *memoriter* method, it avoids some of the difficulties of that style of speaking. The subject so saturates the mind of the speaker that when he stands before his audience he continues to think as he has done for days before, in a certain form, and therefore speaks in the very language that has clothed his thoughts as they have been revolved in his mind in private without conscious effort to recall anything.

Daniel Webster evidently prepared and delivered his

speeches generally in this way. He carried a speech in his mind, thought in the best language, and sometimes, in his deep absorption, delivered passages of his great arguments or orations, in solitude, to the dumb creatures that for the nonce, made his audience.

On the day before he was expected to deliver his address of welcome to La Fayette, in Boston, in the year 1825, he was out fishing. Having indifferent luck, Mr. Webster and his companions were about to abandon the pursuit of the fish, when he hooked a very large cod, and, just as it appeared on the surface of the water, he exclaimed, in a loud voice, "Welcome! all hail! and thrice welcome, citizen of two hemispheres."

His famous address on Bunker Hill was planned on Marshpee Brook, while angling; and it is said that the following exclamation was first heard (?) by a couple of huge trout, as he took them from that stream: "Venerable men! you have come down to us from a former generation. Heaven has beautifully lengthened out your lives that you might behold this joyous day."

Some clergymen have succeeded in preaching by this method. But excellent as it may be for some men, under exceptional circumstances, combining partly the advantages of the extemporaneous style with those that belong to the delivery of sermons from manuscript, it could hardly be generally adopted.

It requires opportunities of seclusion and leisure to give much time to the preparation of each sermon; then too, there must be a certain aptitude for this style of preparation and preaching to make it available and effective.

Few Clergymen have the necessary time or quiet, amid the countless small engagements that they must attend to weekly and daily, and the frequent occasions on which they are required to preach or lecture. If a man were *merely* a preacher he might follow this method successfully; but he who is also pastor and Priest must work upon a plan with which constant interruptions will not interfere so seriously as they do with this one.

A third method of preaching without notes, and the

one that I believe to be the best for most clergymen, if they would dispense with the manuscript habitually, may be described thus: Write out the sermon fully, master the substance of what has been written, and speak from the result of this pen preparation, without the formal recollection of the sermon previously composed.

The writer, in his youth, was fascinated by the biography of Sargent S. Prentiss, one of the most powerful and brilliant speakers that this country has ever produced. It was Prentiss' habit to study his speeches thoroughly, write them out rapidly, burn the manuscript, and then go before his audience and pour out a torrent of eloquence without conscious effort to recall a line that he had put on paper. There are few Prentisses in the pulpit, or anywhere else, but there are many men who can follow his method of speaking with great profit, though they could not by that method, or any other, achieve his splendid triumphs of oratory.

The excellences of this plan of preparing and preaching sermons are manifest. There is no temptation to slight one's work—such as the extemporaneous preacher feels; a certain time is set apart for writing—other duties are excluded; while the effort to write helps to concentrate the thoughts; style is kept pure and correct, though it is not made pompous, and the results of reading may be gathered into the sermon and used in public. Besides, as the manuscript is not before the speaker and he is not hampered by the effort to remember what it contains, he can speak easily, with proper play of feeling and feature and tones. And yet he has the confidence that a conscious mastering of the subject gives and can speak with that combined dignity and simplicity of style that the extemporaneous speaker cannot command.

These are not fanciful excellences, they are known to be real and practical from the experience of many who have tried this method, and the number is increasing in the pulpit and in secular life.

That it is difficult to acquire the habit of preaching in this manner, I do not deny; but that almost any man of average ability *can* acquire it I have no doubt.

We should descend to details in discussing this matter, for the best plan badly executed will produce poor results.

First, as to the preparation of the sermon, the writer should have studied his subject and mastered his references thoroughly before he begins to write. Then, with several hours of quiet before him, he should throw himself vigorously into his work, writing rapidly, without self-criticism, *feeling* his audience and writing as if speaking to them—simply, in short sentences; and if possible, he should finish his sermon at one sitting. This sort of composition will assume the style of a spoken discourse and the very form will be recalled, in many cases, when the writer becomes the speaker.

Then, after the sermon has been written, let it be run through the mind, once and again, so that its train of thought, in proper order, can be reproduced. But do not memorize it; forget the topography of the manuscript—the places where certain good passages come in on the pages; even leave the pages without numbers, that the position of paragraphs may be forgotten, and there may be no effort, while speaking, to repeat the language of the notes.

Immediately before speaking it is not well to look over the sermon or even to think much of it. Gambetta, one of the great popular leaders in France, in our own day, made an utter failure in his first appearance at the bar; because he wearied and trammelled himself just before the argument was made by working it over. His case luckily went over to another sitting of the court.

His shrewd client, who knew the power of his young counsel, called on him on the morning when his second effort was to be made, took a comfortable breakfast with him, engaged him in interesting conversation on a subject foreign to the case, walked with him to the court room, each smoking a cigar, and thus kept him diverted till he rose to speak. Then he delivered the first of those powerful speeches that made him famous in a land of orators.

Having made the best preparation possible, one should

not worry over the sermon immediately before delivery, for it will rob one of all freshness and nervous force when one comes to speak. Without opening the manuscript, glance down the train of thought, touching and connecting prominent points, so that you will be confident that you have them in your mind, then dismiss the sermon and feel sure that it will come at your bidding like an obedient servant. When you rise to speak, pronounce your first sentence and move off upon the tide of thought and feeling that rises *now* and not upon that that comes from the *past*. The tongue will repeat much that the pen has written, perhaps all that should be said, changing for the better, adding and omitting as the intuitions of a speaker direct.

In a few years a facility in speaking in this manner will be acquired that will surprise him who adopts it, and he will find that he thinks better and makes stronger, truer sentences on his feet, in the presence of his audience, than in his study. He will be able to speak more accurately without previous preparation when necessary, and to write more vigorously and naturally than he could have done without the disciplining power of this manner of studying and delivering his sermons. No work pays so well. The end sought is difficult of attainment, but it can be reached by any man of fair capacity and culture, and *ought* to be.

I say again, that I do not counsel the entire banishment of the manuscript from the pulpits of the Church, but I do maintain that it is used too exclusively, and that the clergy should be able, when occasion requires, to do without it, and many of them should preach without it as a rule.

It has become a reproach to us that we cannot pray without the book or preach without the paper. Let us stick to the Prayer Book, but, in a country where other men who undertake to teach or to persuade the people *speak* to them, we must be *speakers* rather than *readers*, or we shall fail to wield that influence that we ought to exercise as preachers of the Gospel.

JOHN S. LINDSAY.

## FASTING COMMUNION: A REJOINDER.

DR. Benedict in the form of a review of a half dozen pamphlets has set forth, in a condensed shape, the arguments of Kingdon's book against Fasting Communion. I say purposely *against*, for while no doubt the author of that work would say that he advocated "Fasting Communion," yet he would use the expression in a sense not understood by the Church, and with the same laxity of meaning as Protestant dissenters do the word "Catholic," when they profess their belief in the Apostles' Creed. In a foot note Dr. Benedict says, speaking of Kingdon's Book: "We seek to recall attention to it as to a work that has never been answered." He might have added: And to answer which no attempt has ever been made." How can a book be answered in which the author gravely asserts that Fasting when used by the early Church means *after* breakfast. No answer has been made for the best reason in the world, that there is nothing to answer. Now, before proceeding to the real question, there is much rubbish to be cleared away which hampers the discussion and prejudices the mind in the investigation of truth on this subject.

In the first place the question before us is whether Fasting Communion is the custom of God's Church, not whether we approve of the custom or whether in our judgment it tends to reverence or the reverse. Fortunately these questions are quite beyond our province, and thus the fact that Dr. Benedict, when he had the happiness during ten years in a Southern city of advising "many communicants to take some food first," (*i. e.*, before the celebration at 7 A. M.,) "and if that did not pre-



vent faintings and headaches not to come to the communion till a later hour" is not of the slightest importance one way or another; nor any number of such instances; the question still remaining as to whether Dr. Benedict had any right to give such advice. If the custom of God's Church is Fasting Communion, then Dr. Benedict for ten years advised his people to do what was wrong—otherwise not. We have Bishop Kingdon quoted with approbation because he says that "Anything that disturbs devotion and earnestness detracts from due reverence," but here too the whole matter is out of court. The question is: What is the tradition of the Church on the subject? For whatever this is, is true reverence even though it may disturb a certain kind of well-fed and comfortable devotion. In other words, the true state of reverence is that state which is in accordance with the mind of the Church; and if this state involves for some persons faintness and headache it cannot be helped; the observance of the Church's mind on the indissolubility of marriage often involves far greater and more prolonged sufferings.

In the second place Dr. Benedict complains that the "general practice of *this* Church is arraigned and condemned." Is it anything strange or unusual for a corrupt practice to spring up and gain prevalence for a century or two in a particular part of the Church during times of coldness and unbelief? Alas! the history of the Church is only too sad an answer to this question, and, not to mention other things, the withdrawal of the Cup from the Laity for at least an equal length of time in the entire West, shows how easily an evil habit, founded on convenience and *apparent* reverence, (the very reasons which have caused Unfasting Communion to grow prevalent), may gain ground. We are not called upon to say that every communion made after food is sacrilegious or mortal sin, nor to declare that all the thousands of communions of the past century were deprived of spiritual blessings, but if it be the mind of CHRIST and the Church, and if *we know it to be so*, then we do sin if we go counter to that Divine Mind, or "teach men so."

In the third place let it be distinctly understood and remembered that Fasting Communion is of Ecclesiastical and not of Divine Institution, and that this is the universal opinion of Roman authorities who will be recognized as not likely to err on the side of laxity in this matter, I illustrate this by an example. To the question whether a man not fasting but in peril of death may be given the Holy Sacrament, the answer is—yes; because the precept to communicate, is of Divine, the precept to fast only of Ecclesiastical Institution. Moreover, it is expressly on this ground that dispensations from fasting have occasionally been given; *e. g.*, to Charles V.; to some Priests on missions to the Indians; to Louis of France in 1722; also to the Empress Elizabeth, *Cf. Ben. xiv., De Syn. Diocesana, Lib. vi. Cap. Viii.*

In the fourth place it must be understood that there is nothing *per se* sinful in Unfasting Communion, it only becomes so if it is contrary to the mind and usage of the Church of GOD. S. Thomas Aquinas well sets this forth as follows, *P. III. Q. lxxx. A. viii.*:

Anything prevents the worthy reception of this Sacrament in one of two ways. Either first by its own nature, *e. g.*, deadly sin, which is contrary to the signification of the Sacrament; or else secondly on account of the prohibition of the Church, and thus anyone is shut out from receiving this Sacrament worthily if he have already received food and drink, and this for three reasons: First, out of honor to this Sacrament, that the mouth which it enters should be clean from all food or drink; second, for symbolism, to set forth that CHRIST, who is the inward part of this Sacrament, ought first to be poured into our hearts [before our bodies are fed] according to that saying 'seek ye first the Kingdom of God;' thirdly, out of fear of vomiting or drunkenness, which sometimes happen because men have inordinately feasted, as the Apostle says, I Cor. xi. 21.

To recapitulate—The question, before us and the only question, is—is Fasting Communion the custom of GOD's Church? And in answering this question we are not called upon to condemn our ancestors, nor to declare the law of Divine Institution, nor to affirm that every Unfasting Communion is necessarily *per se* sacrilegious and injurious to the soul. These things being premised our investigation becomes much more simple. There is of course one more question which I may be expected to answer, but

which I absolutely decline to consider, to wit: "Granted that Fasting Communion has been the custom and use of the Church, are we bound to continue that custom and use?" I am not writing for persons who would seriously consider this question. All I have set myself the task to do is to show that such has been the tradition of the Church on the subject; if any man feel at liberty, either out of consideration to his own convenience or physical health to break this tradition of the Church, or out of consideration for the comfort of others to teach men so, and thus refuses to allow the ancient customs to prevail, he must answer for such presumption to God, and, in our present lax state of discipline, to God alone.

Dr. Benedict takes issue with the learned world that has preceded him on the question of fact and denies that Fasting Communion is the use and custom and tradition of the Church. Will Dr. Benedict deny that in the year, say 1400, every Christian throughout the world recognized the obligation of Fasting Communion? He cannot deny this at least, and speaking for myself I require nothing more to fix my practice. I would not dare, on my own individual judgment, to run the risk of eating and drinking condemnation to myself through a disobedience to the Divine Will as expressed by the practice of the Church; there is surely at the least a possibility—most will recognize a probability, many a certainty—that what the whole Church then taught as the Will of God and Apostolic tradition might be really so, and if there is this possibility, who that values his soul would dare to break, to avoid a little temporary inconvenience, so innocent and wide spread a practice? In this connection how unanswerable are the words of Bishop Butler in the Introduction to his analogy:

In questions of difficulty or such as are thought so, if the result of examination be that there appears the lowest presumption on one side and none on the other, or a greater presumption on one side though in the lowest degree greater, this determines the question even in matters of speculation; and in matters of practice will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation in point of prudence and of interest to act upon that presumption or low probability, though it be so low as to leave the mind in very great doubt which is the truth, for surely a man is as really bound in prudence to do what upon the whole appears to be for

his happiness as what he certainly knows to be so. Nay, further in questions of great consequence (*e. g.*, a worthy reception of the Holy Communion) a reasonable man will think it concerns him to remark lower probabilities and presumptions than these; such as amount to no more than showing one side of a question to be as supposable and credible as the other, nay, such as but amount to much less even than this.

In the brief limits of an article for the REVIEW I cannot take time to follow Dr. Benedict in his special pleadings to evade the force of the few Patristic quotations he makes and in which, avoiding several of Bishop Kingdon's more absurd blunders, he for the most part follows his leader. I purpose therefore to sketch the history of the usage and then to give a few quotations from the early Fathers upon the subject.

S. Augustine tells us that our LORD :

Abstained from ordering in what manner it (the Holy Communion) should be received in order that this might be reserved for His Apostles to do by whom He was about to arrange His Church, for if He had enjoined that this should always be taken after other food, I believe that no one would have altered that custom. But when the Apostle says, speaking of this Sacrament, 'wherefore, brethren \* \* \* if any man hunger let him eat at home, etc.' He immediately subjoins, 'the rest will I set in order when I come.' Inasmuch, therefore, as it would have taken more than could be comprised in a letter if he had laid down all that order of precedence which the Church universal throughout the world observes, it is given us to be understood that by him was arranged that which is done without any variation of custom everywhere.\* S. Augustine, *Gaumer ed. Tom 1. 139—Ep. 54.*

Dr. Benedict refers to this very text from Corinthians and sneers at building so much on so little; if *we* had built in the XIX century so much on such a text, we would be indeed open to ridicule; but what Dr. Benedict does not mention, changes the matter altogether.

It is not we but S. Augustine who built so much and not in the XIX but at the end of the IV century, and in so building he refers to the living evidence of the "universal Church throughout the world, without any variation of custom everywhere!"

Dr. Benedict's interpretation of S. Paul's words "let him eat at home" is at least curious; he gives in brackets

\* The only possible exception to this was on Maunday Thursday Night and this custom only prevailed generally in a part of Africa and was condemned finally by the Council in Trullo, A. D., 692.

as the meaning "before they leave home." This is not the traditional interpretation but exactly the reverse. *The Interlinear Gloss* (an authority certainly of equal weight and whose exposition would therefore be at least "as supposable and credible," as the other, to use Bishop Butlers words), says, "if any man be hungry and is not willing with patience to wait for the others, let him eat at home his food, that is, let him be fed with the bread of earth but let him *not* afterward receive the Eucharist." And to this interpretation S. Thomas Aquinas, no mean scholar, gives his assent. This is also the opinion of *De Lyra in Loc.* Erasmus in his paraphrase (which was publicly set up in our Churches in England, (Blunt Ref. vol. 1 p. 51) thus renders the passage "but if any man has such a craving for food that he will not put up with the delay, let him eat at his own house, and *not* in the mystic and public communion, lest what was instituted for your salvation be turned into an occasion of damnation."

To return then, to the history of the matter, we not only have the plain statement of S. Augustine that in his time Fasting Communion was universal, but can also trace the various attempts that were made in different parts of the Church to relax this Apostolic tradition.

Some in Africa dared to take food and immediately they are reproved by the third Council of Carthage in A.D. 397. Nearly two centuries later a like abuse began in Spain; and in A. D. 572 the Council of Braja enacts that "If any presbyter shall be found after our edict any longer so mad as to consecrate the oblation not fasting, but after having taken any food, let him be immediately deprived of his office and deposed by his Bishop." *Conc. L. and C. Tom.* v. 898.

From Spain the corruption spread to France and is again checked by the Council of Auxerre A. D. 578. "No Presbyter, Deacon or Sub-Deacon shall touch the Mass after touching meat or drink," *L. and C. Conc. Tom.* v. And again the Council of Macon, A. D., 585, decrees that "no Presbyter with a full stomach or having indulged in wine shall touch the sacrifice or presume to celebrate

Mass—for it is unjust that bodily food should be preferred to spiritual; but if any continue so to do, let him be deposed." *Conc. L. and C. Tom. v.* 982. The Council of Toledo, in A.D. 646, makes still further provision on this subject; from the fact that if the Priest celebrating were taken ill and were unable to finish the service, any Priest even though *unfasting* should go to the Altar and continue it; some Priests who felt ill, took food before their Mass. This the council absolutely condemns as follows: Lest what has been advised by reason of languor of nature should be turned into a dangerous presumption let it be understood that no one, shall celebrate Mass after taking any, even the least, (minimum) meat or drink." *L. And C. Conc. Tom. v.* 18, 839. These constantly recurring Canonical enactments shew how the lax clergy even at that early date, attempted to break this law, and how careful the Church was by the most stringent legislation to secure its observance. In the East there never was any trouble on the subject and the custom has always been preserved there in the most uncompromising rigor, so that a violation of the law is never allowed and dispensations therefore unheard of. Such then is in brief the history of the matter and it will be noticed that the breach of this law is spoken of in the same terms and visited with the same penalties as a breach of the law of chastity, or of the law of honesty. From all this the mind of the Church would seem to be clear enough, and yet a few short quotations from the Fathers may not be amiss.

S. Gregory Nazianzen says, "every action of CHRIST need not be imitated by us, for He celebrated the Mystery of the Passion with His Disciples in an upper room and *after* supper; we do it in the Church and *before* supper." This was in A.D. 381, *Vide Bingham, xv, vii, 8.*

S. Basil (who died in A.D. 380,) distinctly says that: "it is not possible to dare to say Mass *unfasting* *Hom. 1. Jejun.* S. Chrysostom, who died in A.D. 407, says, "but thou before thou hast partaken *fastest*, that in a certain way thou mayest appear worthy of the Communion."



ion;" he then goes on to recommend that they should likewise fast afterward. But lest they should think this *after* fast of obligation he adds "what then? ought we to fast after receiving? I do not say this nor do I use any compulsion. This indeed were well, but I do not enforce this." The one was enforced, the other recommended. *Hom. xxvii., in 1 Cor. xi.* In his ninth homily to the people of Antioch he argues that if they eat their breakfast and therefore cannot receive the Holy Communion, yet that there is no reason they should not come and assist at the Mass and hear the sermon. Once more: Chrysostom, when charged with having given to some persons not fasting the Holy Sacrament, answers with great violence, "if I have done any such thing let my name be stricken from the roll of Bishops, and let it not be written in the book of the Orthodox Faith, for if I have done any such thing CHRIST will reject me also from His Kingdom. *Ep.* 125 A. D. *Cyr.*

It should be added that after this statement he goes on to say that even if he had done so he would have imitated CHRIST at the institution of the Divine Mysteries, from which it may be gathered that he held the same view as the Church does now, viz: That the obligation is of Ecclesiastical and not Divine Institution. It does not seem necessary to multiply quotations to prove what has never been denied by any scholar of weight and I therefore close with a few words by S. Augustine.

It is clear that when the Disciples first received the Body and Blood of the LORD they were not fasting. Must we therefore censure the universal Church because the Sacrament is everywhere partaken of by persons fasting? Nay, verily, for *from that time it pleased the Holy Ghost*, to appoint for the honor of so great a Sacrament that the Body of the Lord should take the precedence of all other food entering the mouth of a Christian; and it is for this reason that the custom referred to is *universally observed*.

The authority of S. Augustine is conclusive of the universality of the practice in his own times. Four centuries later Paschasius Radbertus is equally clear for his times—"This is the Sacrament, which the LORD after supper delivered to his Apostles. \* \* \* But *universally* in the Church *all fasting* with the highest devotion are

wont to communicate. *Lib. De. Sang. et Corp. Dei. Cap. 20.* Four centuries later still brings us to the times of S. Thomas Aquinas who has been already quoted.

From this it is evident that from the year 400 (at latest) to the year 1500 Fasting Communion was a custom "universally observed," as S. Augustine says, because "it so pleased the Holy Ghost to appoint for the honor of so great a Sacrament."

It may not be deemed superfluous here to add that the law of Fasting Communion was most strenuously enforced in our own Anglo Saxon Church and that by a Canon in the reign of King Edgar (A.D. 960) it is enjoined that "no man take the Housel after he hath broken his fast, except it be on account of extreme sickness." The Council of Constance, A.D. 1415, in which the Church of England was represented, enacted as follows, "the praiseworthy authority of the second Canon and the approved custom of the Church, has held and still holds that a sacrament of this kind ought not to be celebrated after supper, nor received by the faithful who are not fasting except in case of infirmity or other necessity. *Council of Constance Sess. xiii.*

The law of the Church of England on this subject has never been changed, and while indeed of late years a contrary practice has largely prevailed, yet we must look upon it as a corruption, the more so as there has been a constant protest against it from the most devout and pious men of the Church. Mr. Malcolm Mac Coll in his well known book on *Lawlessness Sacerdotalism and Ritualism* says, "I find in a book already quoted that Fasting Communion was the rule of the Church of England in the days of Queen Elizabeth" third ed. p. 209 the book referred to is a *Counter Poyson*. Richard Cosin, Dean of Arches, who died in A.D. 1597, speaks of the Primitive Church having altered the "time of receiving the Sacrament to have it received as it is in the morning fasting." *An answer to an abstract of certain Acts of Parliament* p. 60, 1584.

Still later Bishop Jeremy Taylor says "it is the custom of the Church of great antiquity and propor-

tionate regard that every Christian that is in health should receive the blessed Sacrament fasting:" *Worthy Communicant*, vii. i.

And again, in his *Ductor Dubitantum* (bk. iii, chap. iv, r, xv), under the caption of Rule xv "the *Laudable Customs of the Catholic Church* which are in present observation do oblige the conscience of all Christians,"—gives Fasting Communion as an example of such obligatory customs. "It is a Catholic custom that they who receive the Holy Communion should receive it fasting. \* \* \* He that despises this custom gives nothing but the testimony of an evil mind." Bishop Taylor died in 1667, soon after the Restoration and labored with all his power to revive the lost Catholic customs which had been universal before the great rebellion. Bishop Sparrow who died twenty years later says: (*Rationale on B. C. P.*) "This sacrament should be received fasting, and so was the practice of the universal Church which is authority enough to satisfy any that love not contention." From all this, and quotations could easily be multiplied, it is clearly seen that no such uniform disuse has prevailed as has been asserted by Bishop Kingdon and implied by Dr. Benedict, and therefore in the absence of any expression of will to the contrary we are forced to conclude that this matter of Fasting Communion is one of those points on which, as Canon XXX says:

So far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practiced that it doth with reverence retain these ceremonies which do neither endanger the Church of GOD, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they are fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity and from the Apostolical Churches which were their first founders.

This conclusion we are the more established in by the consideration of the test proposed in the preface *Of Ceremonies* in the English Prayer Book, viz.: "What would S. Augustine have said?" For to this we must answer in his own words: "It pleased the Holy Ghost to appoint for the honor of so great a Sacrament that the Body of the LORD should take the precedence of all other food

entering the mouth of a Christian; and it is for this reason that the custom referred to is universally observed."

It may be well to add that the fact that the custom of the Church always has been Fasting Communion is not only affirmed by Catholic writers but by all scholars who are capable of giving an opinion on the subject.

Let Cardinal Bona, then, speak for the Catholic world; for, says Bishop Kingdon on this subject, "The assertions of Cardinal Bona will be found to be as accurate as most of the conclusions of that scholarly writer." "It is therefore an ancient and Apostolic tradition that no one should dare to approach the Divine mysteries unless he be fasting: The contrary abuse the Councils and Fathers treat as the gravest crime against the Church, and inflict for it the most weighty punishments of an anathema and deposition. *Bona, Rerum Liturg, Lib. 1, Cv. 21.*

To represent the Protestant world, I do not know that I can do better than give the words of Dr. George W. Sprott, at the present time minister of North Berwick, one of the lecturers on Pastoral Theology appointed by the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland. This distinguished Presbyterian divine says, "there is no authority for fast days before the observance of the LORD'S Supper, in the legislation of the Church (*i. e.* Scottish Establishment) though the practice of receiving the Communion fasting is almost as old as Christianity and was common in some parts of Scotland till a generation ago." *The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland, Lecture III.*

HENRY R. PERCIVAL.

## THE JOURNAL OF THE GENERAL CON- VENTION OF 1883.

**I**N *The Living Church* of January 26th ult. is an official notice from the Secretary of the House of Deputies, stating "The General Convention has amended the Lectionary contained in the Book of Common Prayer, by substituting for the Tables in said book *certain other Tables*, and by inserting," etc.

In an unofficial letter, published under the same date, the Secretary says "no provision was made for the distribution of the Lectionary, and it seemed best not to give official notice until the clergy had generally supplied themselves with the Lectionary in the several almanacs." He also says "most of the clergy will receive copies of the Journal and Digest"—and—"the Lectionary is printed from plates used by the Committee in making their report to the Convention."

It is my desire, having the "Journal and Digest" before me, as well as several almanacs, to make a cursory review of said Digest, and of the Journal as far as it refers to the Lectionary, and also of the almanacs as they publish the Lectionary as amended.

I. A number of Canons were amended during the last Convention, as is usually the case. A committee of two Bishops, and two Clergymen, was appointed to certify the changes made in the Canons, and their report is found on pages 624 to 632 of the Journal.

As a rule, Theological Students, who are required to study the Canons, will receive only a copy of the Digest, (many of them may have to buy that) and no copy of the changes as certified by the Committee will be placed in their hands. It is possible that the Professors who teach

Canon Law will use only the Digest, and will not have a copy of the certified changes to which to refer. In fact it is possible that but a small proportion of the clergy, and very few of the laity will see this certified list of changes, or if they see it, will think it necessary to compare it with the Digest as printed. I therefore propose calling attention to some discrepancies, and would say that I was led to examine the Report and the Digest by the accidental discovery of an important error. Amendments were made to Title I, Canon 5, §1, (1), Canon 9; Canon 15, §ii (2), §iii (1), §vii, (3), (4), §viii (7), §ix, (2), §xv, (2), (3), §xvi, (4), §xvii, (1); Canon 16. Title II, Canon 1 §v; Canon 2, §ii; Canon 11, §ii. Title III, Canon 3 was repealed. Canons 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were renumbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Canon 8 (now renumbered 7) was amended, and Canon 9 (now renumbered 8) was amended in articles IV, V, VI, VII, VIII and IX, § ii.

There are differences of punctuation between the changes as certified by the Committee, and the Digest as published, in twenty-two places; \*there are differences in the use of capitals and small letters in seventeen places †.

In Title I Canon 5 §i (1) line 5, the Digest has "his," the Committee Report has "the." In Title II Canon 2, § ii lines 3 and 11, the Digest has "rumor" and the Report has "rumour" and in Title III, Canon 8, Article VIII line 3 the Digest has "the," the Report has "this."

These are probably only errors in proof-reading, but they indicate a carelessness that should be avoided in so important a publication as the Digest.

Beyond this, however, Title I, Canon 15, §vii, 4, 5, 6 have been variously and extensively amended, *and no foot notes mark the fact.* The same must be said of Title I,

\* *Differences in Punctuation.*—Title I, Canon 15, §ii (2) 2d line; §iii (1), line 6; §vii, (4) line 5; §vii (5) line 6; §viii, (7) lines 3 and 4; §xv (2) line 2; §xvi (4), lines 1, 10 and 12; §xvii (1), line 7; Canon 16, §i, line 5. Title II, Canon 1, §v, line 2; Canon 11, §ii (3) line 1, 2 errors; §ii (4) line 2; §ii (5) line 1. Title III, Canon 7, §i, lines 1 and 2; Canon 8, Article IV, line 13; Article VI, line 5.

† *Differences in use of Capitals and Small Letters.*—Title I, Canon 5, §i (1) lines 3 and 8; Canon 9, §i, line 3; Canon 15, §viii (7) lines 10 and 11; §xvi (4) line 9; §xvii (1) line 6, 2 errors. Title II, Canon 1, §v, lines 2 and 4; Canon 2 §ii, lines 2 and 3. Title III, Canon 8, Article IV, line 5; Article VII, line 5, Article IX, §ii, line 7.



Canon 15, §viii, 7, §ix, 2, §xv, 2, § xvii, i: Title I, Canon 16, §1: Title II, Canon 11, §2, 3, 4, 5; and Title III, Canon 8, (now 7).

Here are a number of amendments, some of them important, which, to the ordinary student of the Digest, tell no story of amendment. Here is still further indication of carelessness on the part of the Editor of the Digest.

Beyond this, however, are indications of carelessness, which involve both the Editor of the Digest, and the Committee appointed to certify to the changes made.

Title I, Canon 16, §ii was amended by both Houses. No foot note calls attention to the amendment. *It is not made in the Digest, and it does not appear in the Report of the Committee which certified the changes made.*

The Rev. Wm. Tatlock, D.D., Secretary of the House of Bishops, on page 4 of the Journal, calls attention to Title I, Canon 16; *Of a List of Ministers of this Church*, and says, in concluding, "and at or before each General Convention the Secretary is to be furnished with a list of Ordinations and Depositions since the preceding General Convention, to be published in the Journal." The Canon of 1880 said, "the said list shall, from time to time, be published in the Journal of the General Convention." The House of Bishops (Journal page 213) amended the Canon so that it should read "*and said list shall be published in the Journal of each Convention.*" The House of Deputies (Journal page 303) adopted the Resolution "this House concurs"—when they learned that "the object proposed is to be accomplished without expense to the Convention."

This Resolution of concurrence was sent to the House of Bishops (Journal page 114), and referred to the Committee on Canons, with the other matters contained in the message, and as no veto appears, and as the Secretary of the House of Bishops calls attention to this amendment as quoted above, it was undoubtedly an amendment to the Canon.

The Committee to certify the changes say that the amendment is "and shall, from time to time, be pub-

lished." So also the Digest, and both Committee and Digest ignore the amendment.

This omission makes all the difference between an occasional, and a triennial, record of Ordinations, Deaths and Depositions, and the object of the Bishops, which was apparently to provide for a systematic and authorized list of those added to the ministry by ordination, or lost to it by death or deposition, becomes defeated, for three years any way, until another Convention can amend the Journal, and order the correction of the Digest.

This may also be a small matter, but in a publication like the Journal, it is an indication of carelessness that should be avoided.

In consequence of this error, the list is not published in the Journal of 1883. Possibly copies will be made from stereotype plates, and offered for sale, or possibly an official notice may be issued, referring Church Wardens and Vestries, as well as Bishops and Standing Committees, to the "several almanacs," one of which contains the name of a Clergyman, who left the ministry fifteen years ago, and another of which does not contain, and has not for ten years, so I am told, the name of a Clergyman in regular standing.

Title III, Canon 8 (now 7), was amended. (Journal pages, 102, 107, 189, 285), but the Committee to certify the changes do not seem to have had this change brought to their notice, as they make no mention of it in their Report, and the new Digest does not contain it. Some two months after the issue of the Journal, the Secretary discovered this omission, and sent to every Clergyman a copy of an amended Canon that could be pasted over the unamended page of the Digest, and an extra page of certifications from the Committee, as voucher for the change. Title I, Canon 15, §xvi (4), as to the resignation of a Bishop, and his title to retain his seat, is reported as amended by the Committee and printed as amended in the Digest. (In the Journal, pages 14, 22, 39, 107, 209, 252, 295, 313, 314, 322) refer to this matter, and page 313 shows that on motion of the Rev. Dr. Farrington, the whole subject was postponed

until the next General Convention. The very amendment which was thus put over for three years is *certified to by the Committee, and in the Digest* a foot note calls attention to it *as an amendment added in 1883*. A reference to pages 314 and 322, however, shows that the House concurred in another amendment to this Canon, and the probability is that the Committee and the Editor got the two amendments mixed.

Here are two amendments not inserted and one seriously questioned. Who among the Professors will study out these things for their students? Who among the students will be made certain as to the changes made? On what basis will their certainty rest? Should any questions arise under these amended Canons, who is to interpret them satisfactorily? And of what value is that certificate on page 148 of the Digest?

II. Again, in looking at the Journal, one misses the familiar forms of Episcopal Reports. It is true they are tabulated, but why not refer to the "several almanacs" for this tabulation? This however may be a small matter. On page 174 of the Journal, the order is given for making a summary, but was it intended to take the place of the reports as usually printed?

III. Once more, the "Book Annexed" is not printed in the Appendix, as every one, who had not the opportunity of purchasing copies before the meeting of the Convention, had hoped it would be. It is referred to in the Supplemental Journal many times; and referred to by pages, as though every one of the Clergy, and as many of the Laity as had an interest in the proposed enrichment of the Liturgy, were already supplied with a copy. It is possible however that copies of the Book Annexed may be sent to the Conventions of the several Dioceses, and be printed in their several Journals, thus bringing it before the people who will have to decide as to its adoption or rejection. But, so far, no official copy, of the most important work of the Convention is available, and when we would like to know what is meant by "In Part (c), rubric (B. A., p. 247 second rubric), insert '*at the earlier Service*' after '*omitted*;' and for

'have been previously used' read, 'be used once,'" We must do—what? Wait for official notice to search the "several almanacs"? or buy an authorized copy made from stereotype plates from the Secretary? or—what?

Probably the Book Annexed was not published in the Journal because of the expense that would thus be entailed.

It was published in the AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW for November, 1883.

I have before me a copy of *The Pastor, a Monthly Journal for Priests*. This magazine contains the *Rubrical Speciales Breviarii Romani Reformata*, with this note :

A clergyman facetiously remarked on the appearance of the new rubrics and offices that the Sacred Congregation was making a fortune for the booksellers. The following rubrics it would be simply impossible for any one to remember at proper time and place. But even so, there is no need of our contributing to the fortune of our bookseller's daughters. It is a very simple matter to put a VIDE at each feast in Breviary and Missal, and glance at this number of the *Pastor* as each recurs to see what the VIDE directs.

Now why cannot the Secretary issue an unofficial notice, which, while endorsing the several almanacs with which the clergy are to supply themselves, shall extend the endorsement to the November number of the AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, and suggest to us that a *Vide*, with a page reference to said REVIEW, placed on the margins of our Prayer Books, will direct us to the changes, and not only save the General Convention the expense of publishing the results of its labors, but also save the Diocesan Conventions the expense of publishing the Book Annexed, and save the Clergy the expense of buying the Supplemental Journal, especially as the purchase of said Journal only results in finding that the Book Annexed, is *not annexed at all*.

IV. And lastly, let us return to our starting point. Have we a Lectionary? If we have, where is it? The Lectionary of the Prayer Book has been amended by substi-

tuting certain other tables—repealed in fact. The Lectionary, whose use was permissive from 1880 to 1883 was amended by the last Convention, and, as amended, was adopted by both Houses. It is referred to on pages 9, 60, 61, 162, 188, 216, 227, 228, 353, 396, of the Journal, from which we learn the fact of the adoption of a new Lectionary with Numbers xxii. restored to use on the 9th Sunday after Trinity; and we further learn that the Apocryphal lessons were retained, and were ordered to be printed in a different type from the rest of the tables.

Where has this been done? The Journal contains no copy of the Lectionary thus printed, in fact no copy of any Lectionary, and our only guide to one is the unofficial note of the Secretary to the *Living Church*, suggesting that it might be found in the "several almanacs."

Did he know the almanacs would publish it? and did he know, did he have any reason to know, that they would publish the Lectionary adopted by the General Convention? Or did he examine them before writing that letter, to see that they published the Lectionary as the Convention ordered it to be published? And has the Convention any right to shift the publishing of their Lectionary upon the almanacs? And, in supplying themselves with the "several almanacs" have the clergy any guarantee that they have a correct copy of the new Lectionary?

For instance, the *Protestant Episcopal Almanac* professes to give the new Lectionary. This differs from the one in the Prayer Book, yet in no case is the order of the Convention followed with reference to printing the names of the Apocryphal books in a different type—while in Lent, one set of lessons is given which agrees with neither the Prayer Book, nor either of the two sets given in the *Living Church Annual*. Here is a possibility for four daily morning services in any one church, with a *different set of lessons at each service*. Or, if the Prayer Book set is repealed, as we have reason to believe, then with three sets of lessons. For the Feast of the Annunciation may be read at Morning Prayer for the first lesson,

Genesis iii., 1-16, Job xxxviii., v. 19, or Ecclesiasticus ii., and for most of the other Festival Days a choice of two lessons is given.

*Living Church Annual* gives a double barrelled set of Sunday lessons, one being the Prayer Book set which is supposed to be repealed,—the other is supposed to be the new Lectionary, but the names of the Apocryphal books are printed in the same type as the others—and for the 9th Sunday after Trinity this almanac does not give Numbers xxii. in its new Lectionary, but numbers xvi, 1-41 and xvii.

*McCalla and Stavely's Annual* seems to be like the *Living Church Annual*, yet a comparison of the lessons for the first Sunday in Lent shows us—Jer. 7, or Jer. 7, v 21, in *McCalla and Stavely's*, and Jer. vii, or Jer. vii, 1-21 in the *Living Church Annual*. A comparison of the three almanacs for the 2d lesson on the morning of the Annunciation shows us a variation indeed, viz:—*McCalla and Stavely's Annual*, Luke x, v 25, Luke i, 39-57, *Whittaker's Almanac* Mark x, 1-17, Luke i, 39-57, *Living Church Annual* Luke x, 1-25, Luke i, 39-57; For the 5th Sunday in Lent we have a choice—Zech. xii, Dan. vii, Dan vii, 1-19, and for Sept. 30, we have this assortment of Evening Lessons Jer. li, 1-35, Hosea 5 and 6, v 8-7, Dan. x. v 4; Hosea 5, v 8-6, 7. These specimens are taken at random. *McCalla and Stavely's Annual*, gives Numbers xxii. on the 9th Sunday after Trinity, thus approximating to the Amended Lectionary, but nowhere prints the Apocryphal books in a type different from the other lessons.

The result of the search for the Lectionary in the above "several almanacs" has discouraged me from examining *Roper's Kalendar*, *The Church Almanac*, or the Lectionary printed from stereotype plates and for sale by the Secretary. But the Secretary did not refer us to that in his unofficial letter.

Here are the principal almanacs to which the Secretary refers clergymen for the new Lectionary, differing from each other, giving a bewildering assortment of lessons. Which is right? Which is authoritative? And



which set does the Secretary propose to sell for ten cents?

There is no Lectionary in the Journal. Having the plates, as he tells us in his advertisement of various Convention publications for sale, why could he not have added a few pages more to the Journal and given the clergy a Lectionary upon which they could rely, and which, even if not quite complying with the amendments of the General Convention, would have enabled us to be uniform in our errors?

The Lectionary was adopted and authorized on the 15th and 16th of October 1883, and about the middle of March 1884, the clergy generally received a pamphlet, called a "Supplementary Appendix to the Journal," which contained Tables of Lessons of Holy Scripture. "Set forth and *Enjoined* to be used." This is presumably the Lectionary adopted. An official note to the Editor of the paper referred to at the beginning of this article, forewarned us of its appearance, and in this way the question as to our Lectionary is solved.

Now does it not seem reasonable, that when the General Convention undertakes such an important work as repealing one Lectionary, and establishing a new one, it should give its Secretaries authority to do two things, yea three,

1. Issue a notice to every Clergyman, and every parish and mission station, stating what had been done, and when the new arrangement would begin to take effect.

2. Send a copy, duly authenticated, of the changes made, a reasonable time before the change in the mode of conducting that part of the service is to be made.

3. Print in the official publication of the Convention, a perfect and standard copy of the new arrangement as finally adopted.

IRVING McELROY.

## OPEN LETTERS.

TO THE RIGHT REV. HENRY C. LAY, D. D.

*Right Rev. and Dear Sir:*

**T**HIS is not the first time, if I remember rightly, that you have been addressed in this manner, and on a subject which lies very near your heart, and concerning which you have done so much to arouse attention and sympathy, and I hope touch the conscience of the Church. I allude of course to the matter of disabled and aged Clergymen and the helplessness and destitution in which they find themselves when age or sickness comes; the gravity of the subject is my only excuse for troubling you, and for further bringing it before the Church. There are some aspects of the case which it seems to me, have not as yet sufficiently been considered, and to which it is purposed in this letter to call attention.

That there is grievous trouble and wrong somewhere, some great cause which wrung out this cry of pain, is evident. Palliations of any wide-spread disease may be of temporary benefit, but if they shall obscure or call attention away from seeking the source of the trouble, they are worse than useless. We know some of the symptoms,—pain is a symptom, a friendly warning of Nature that there is wrong within, but it is not the wrong itself. Have we as yet found the cause? or having found it, has it been revealed? Have we as yet got a true “diagnosis,” or one which the “Doctors of the Church” will admit to be true, or if admitting to be true, they are able or willing to act upon?

Now what is the matter, the root difficulty of the trouble? where does it lie? It may be more easy to ask these questions than to answer them. There

may be many apparent sources, but as in malarial affections of the body, may they not all, or nearly all, at last be traced to one source,—our system, our method, our polity in short? Have we carefully looked in this direction to find the cause?

We are an Episcopal Church. The name means something, a great deal, and it would be great unwisdom to throw the name away. Names are things, but what sort of things? What does this word "Episcopal" mean and imply? It does not mean only that we have Bishops, but that we have a *polity*. It is an Episcopal *Church*. It is not a Congregational Church; and wherein is the difference? A Congregational Church is one wherein the local congregation is the integer, the complete and perfect unit, confessedly so; an autonomy, self-producing, self-governing and self sustaining. Such is the theory, the practice of our congregational friends; they are consistent with their polity, whatever we may think of the Scripturalness and catholicity of that *polity*.

But what is an *Episcopal* Church? Wherein does it differ from the other? Is it an aggregation of a certain number of virtually congregational bodies, yet each independent, autonomous, which may or may not be "in union with" a vogue, loose and indefinite ecclesiastical body called a Diocese, within the bounds of which they happen to be found? Such seems to be the case in fact, but ought it to be such? Should not an "Episcopal Church" be one, a city at unity in itself? If so, wherein does that *unity* lie? In short is what we call the Diocese one or many? What is the body and what the members thereof? Right here, I take it is the difference between an Episcopal and a Congregational Church.

But what has this to do with aged and broken down clergymen? We shall see. When a man is called to Holy Orders, it is the Church that is the Diocese, through her officers, especially her official head, which calls and ordains him. The Church is not the Bishop, nor in the Bishop, as some seem to teach, more than the Government is in the President, or a kingdom in its king. Louis XIV might say "I am the State," but that did not make him so, but

the Church, which is "the Body," ordains men to Holy Functions, sets them apart to a holy end, they become in an especial way the servants of CHRIST and His Church. A compact, a mutual agreement as it were, is then entered into. The ordained promises his life, his talents, such as GOD has bestowed upon him, to the service of the Church; and on the other hand the Church assumes, or should assume, a responsibility for his material wants. The Church is the concrete and visible representation of the Gospel, and "they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." I take it that nothing can be more clear than that such a compact is intended to be made.

And now what further in fact has the Church, as such, to do with those she ordains? As things are, nothing. In her corporate capacity she has nothing for them to do, no place for them. They who "wait at the Altar are part-takers with the Altar," but in fact she has no Altar at which they may serve, no place for them to preach that Gospel which they are sent to preach, and consequently no bread for them to live upon. If they go upon the "highways" to exercise their functions, they may become liable as intruders upon another's "premises." In other words the power of *Mission* has been lost to the Church. She has abandoned it to bodies which are congregational in their orders and secular in fact, creatures of the Civil Law. If one of these secular bodies, composed it may be largely of unbaptized men, see fit to "call" to hire at its own pleasure, and on its own terms, one whom the Church has ordained, he may find for a time, under the restriction of "pleasing" those who "call" him, opportunity of preaching the Word, and receive such compensation as this secular body is able or willing to give.

Is it not so? Have you the power as a Bishop to send one on whom you have laid hands to any field, unless it be the poorest missionary spot in your Diocese? And can you keep a man, however faithful he may be at his post, if faction or opposition has risen? He must "go," and you and the Church cannot help it. Starvation awaits him if he remains.

And when men have spent the flower of their age and

strength in the service of these local and secular bodies, and "Autumn days" are come, these so-called "parishes," for the most part, cannot if they would, find support for the worn-out men who have served them so long. The Church, which cannot even "send" them at first, of course can do nothing for them, and—you know the rest.

The Bishops only, as things are, have permanent places, and some guaranty, such as it is, for support in old age; and why they more than others? Why has not Priest as much claim on the Church as Bishop? Why are the common Clergy "birds of passage," as a Bishop is reported to have called them, having no home? It may be said that one is a Diocesan officer, the other is not; but the Diocese is the Church, and as such should be responsible for both.

And here is the fault. It is our working system, our actual polity, which makes the Church Episcopal but Congregational in fact; Episcopal for Bishops but Congregational for Priests. In a Church rightly organized, both Bishop and Priest should be the servants of and cared for alike by the Church.

Right here, dear Bishop, I conceive to be the *fons et origo* of the difficulty. Are we willing to look it in the face? Is it not a true diagnosis, and can there be any permanent cure until the cause is removed, and can the cause ever be removed? It will demand a reformation, a revolution, no less. Can it ever be brought about? If disease is constitutional, the remedy must be such; mere palliatives are of little avail. Or is the trouble organic, self-seated, incurable? If so, your progress and anxiety and labor of love are all in vain. There is no help. The Clergy have the grave, and that only in this world before them. Fifty years ago the pastors in the Congregational body as a rule were settled for life; now, almost every where, they are *hired* from year to year. And the same tendency exists with us. The Institution Office is little used and less heeded. In many parishes the congregational practice has obtained, and every year security in tenure of place is be-

coming less and less. As things go the best thing the ordinary Priest can do, after he has passed fifty, if the good LORD will let him, is to die and go Paradise; but GOD help his family, if he have one! Gray hairs are not wanted. The experience and wisdom which only can come with years are only sought after in the affairs of the world. And the complaint comes that young men of promise are not seeking Holy Orders, and why, as things are should they? Especially is this true of the sons of the Clergy, and can we blame them? The prospect of dark days in the home and suffering and sorrow to the gray hairs of parents forbids. Can we ask our young men to take these sacred obligations upon them when the Church has thus abandoned care and responsibility for them? In theory they become the servants of the Church, in fact the servants of the world. Obligations are mutual, as has been said, and the Church does not keep her part of the contract; under our working system she cannot do it. Why, then, should men be placed in a position from which the Church is powerless to extricate them, and from which with honor they cannot extricate themselves!

It may be said that this argues want of faith on the part of men. Perhaps it does. Does it not argue as well want of "good faith" as well as justice on the part of the Church? It is hard even to suggest this, for it may be from misfortune rather than from fault, but the fact exists. Obligations are mutual, and "Faith and Works" inseparable on either hand.

Is it not the wiser course to confess the trouble, and honestly in the sight of GOD to seek for and endeavor to remove the cause?

But I will not further trouble you. My thought, meagrely stated, is before you. Is it or is it not true?

Obediently yours in CHRIST,

D. D. CHAPIN.



## RECENT LITERATURE.

*The Gospel According to S. Matthew. With Notes Critical and Practical.* By the Rev. M. F. SADLER, New York: James Pott.

Prebendary Sadler is author of *Church Doctrine, Bible Truth. The Sacrament of Responsibility*, and other valuable works well-known to American Churchmen. Knowing his soundness in the Faith and his clear convictions as to the position and claims of the Church, we should expect of course that in exegesis he would carry out and enforce the same principles as prevail in his writings everywhere. An examination of the present volume will satisfy any one that the learned commentator has so done. In an introduction of some forty pages, Mr. Sadler discusses, accurately and satisfactorily, the origin and sources of the Four Gospels; gives specially appropriate statements prefatory to S. Matthew's Gospel, and explains the nature and scope of the short, critical notes which he has furnished. Like some other good Churchmen and able critics, he speaks out manfully in favor of the *Textus Receptus*, "so blown upon (as he indignantly says) and despised as corrupt and uncritical, and I know not what." There seems to be something of a reaction setting in, in regard to this much talked of text of the New Testament, and Wescott and Hort's text does not appear likely to obtain the assent of all scholars in England or America.

The notes are rightly characterized as critical and practical. They are sufficiently full for all ordinary purposes, and they are just the kind of notes which supply accurate knowledge and explanation of the sacred Word,

always, also, being in entire accord with the Catholic Faith, as set forth in the Catholic Creeds, and ever held by the Catholic Church.

*English Style in Public Discourse.* With special reference to the Usages of the Pulpit. By AUSTEN PHELPS, D.D., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

We congratulate those theological students who had the direct training of Dr. Phelps. Contact with a professor of such versatile talent and scholarly culture must have been an inspiration to study. And we thank him for widening his influence by the publication of his seminary instructions. This book like its predecessors, with all its technical treatment, is yet pre-eminently popular in its material and structure. Again, it is far more than it claims to be. While professedly designed for those looking forward to Holy Orders it is so broad in its sweep and so general in its analysis that its Introduction is adapted to every profession employing oral or written address.

We know of no more thorough or satisfactory statement of the fundamental qualities or elements of style, or of no better book to put into the hands of an immature student, who is ambitious of literary attainments as an ornament or aid to his professional work. The book contains twenty lectures, with an appendix, comprising a "catalogue of words and phrases which are violations of English purity or of precision." Some of the best material of the book is to be found in the form of "Excursus," in which there is an apparent deviation from the topic of the lecture, but the affiliation of thought, and the incisive application of some salient truth, more than compensates for the breach of continuity. Lecture XII, "The Intellectuality of the Pulpit," is masterly, and while not so strictly didactic as some others, is the priceless gem in a setting of valuable brilliants.

*Thoughts upon the Liturgical Gospels.* By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULDBURN, D.D. 2 Vols. New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co.

Dean Gouldburn stands high as a devotional writer. Nearly all his books, excepting the *Bampton Lectures*,

have this character, and are intended for religious use. In these volumes the purpose is designedly devotional. The Gospels for the Sundays of the Christian year are broken into sections, so that a passage or two falls to each day, with short comment upon it, which is intended to assist the reader in meditation and prayer. The conception is very thoroughly carried out. First, the Gospel for the Sunday is given in black-letter text, then come the variations in different books of service, then the comment on the authority of the text, and then the devotional commentary for the several days of each week. The plan is simple, and is worked out with fidelity rather than in any startling way. This, indeed, is always Dr. Gouldburn's fashion. None of his books are interesting, unless the reader brings himself within the author's limits, but, if one yields to him, the thoroughly calm and English way of putting things will be directly felt, and in the event Dr. Gouldburn will become a favorite religious guide. He is a healthy writer and can be trusted. These books will be prized by the Clergy for their exact and careful scholarship, by intellectual people for their strictly devotional atmosphere, by quiet and devout Christians for their suggestions for the guidance of the spiritual life. They represent Dr. Gouldburn at his best. The introductory sections are specially valuable to scholars.

*James Skinner: A Memoir.* By the Author of *Charles Lowder*. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench & Co.

This volume is almost the sequel to the Life of "*Charles Lowder*. Mr. Skinner was a fellow worker with Mr. Lowder at S. Barnabas', Pimlico, and each bore his share of the hostility aroused against the East London mission Churches, because an elaborate ritual was maintained in the services among the poor. Mr. Skinner was largely responsible for the materials that went into Charles Lowder's biography. He carried out in ritual the thoughts and purpose which doctrinally controlled the Tractarian movement of 1883. James Skinner was but a stripling in 1883, and grew up under the special direction of Dr. Hook and Archdeacon Wilberforce.

When Cardinal Newman went to Rome in 1845, young Skinner had been only three or four years in Holy Orders. In 1851 he became Senior Curate of S. Barnabas, then under the charge of the Rev. Robert Liddell, who was the vicar of S. Paul's, and succeeded the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, its first vicar. His health failed him at S. Barnabas, and except that later on he held the parish at Newland for awhile, his life-work was carried on chiefly in his study through the guidance he gave to others in difficult cases of casuistry and the general direction of the advanced movement in the English Church, which was to an exceptional degree confided to him. He was one of its unseen, but most positive influences. His position was one in which he was able to touch its deepest spiritual lines without entering into the actual conflict. The ill health which withdrew him from active labor, gave him all the stronger influence as a religious man, and the memoir is valuable as revealing the way in which he was related to the prominent leaders of the Tractarian and Ritualistic party; to men like Dr. Pusey, Canon Carter and Bishop Wilberforce. His chief theological work was the *Synopsis of Moral Theology*, which was barely finished at the time of his death. The volume is the companion to the *Charles Lowder* though it is far less crowded with incident and touches fewer sympathies. James Skinner was a saintly man, and the story of his restricted career is the story of one who fearlessly did his duty in the station where God had placed him.

*Sermons Preached in Clifton College Chapel, 1879-1883.* By the Rev. J. M. WILSON, M. A., Head-master. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

These school sermons remind one of a similar series preached by Dr. William Everett to the boys at Adams Academy, Quincy, Mass. Mr. Wilson is a Priest of the Church of England; Dr. Everett is a Unitarian Minister; but the same tone of high morality and true manliness is manifest in each volume. Grown people will not like either collection, because they have gone beyond them and need stronger meat, but for eager, growing, inquiring youth there can be nothing better of its kind

than these fresh and vigorous discourses. They touch the right note, and no one who has to do with boys in their school-life should overlook them. They stir both mind and heart, and have the life in them which Dr. Arnold put into his famous Rugby Sermons.

*Voices from a Busy Life:* Selections from the Poetical Works of the late EDWARD WASHBURN, D.D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

Though Dr. Washburn, for the most part, clung steadfastly to plain prose, he had a rare power of poetical utterance, the kindling imagination and the power of magic expression. His verses are chiefly occasional pieces and translations from the old Latin hymns of the Christian Fathers. They are not polished to the extent of weakening the force of the expression, but convey in vigorous terms the lively emotions of the author as he drank in the life of nature, or mused among sacred scenes, or caught the meaning of the Christian festivals. They were well worth collecting, and present an important feature of the intellectual and spiritual life of a many-sided man.

*Darwinism in Moral and other Essays.* By FRANCES POWER COBBE. Boston: George H. Ellis.

Though Churchmen are far from following a theist like Miss Cobbe, her writings are so full of the light of Christian common sense, that they ought not to be neglected. This volume is a collection of miscellaneous essays on morals and religion which have appeared in English periodicals during the last twenty years, and which will be found extremely useful for suggestive reading. Miss Cobbe is a candid and serious thinker, and always writes with earnestness and sincerity. She is hardly a theologian; but, within certain definite limits, her writings have considerable value. She is an ardent believer in the religious consciousness, and holds little in common with Mr. Herbert Spencer.

*The Epistles of S. John: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays.* By BROOKS FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.,

It is somewhat difficult to speak of the present work without seeming to run into extravagance of commendation. Dr. Westcott has spent many years (more than thirty, he tells us), upon the writings of S. John, and has studied them with a devout carefulness and thoroughness rarely equalled and probably never excelled, criticism in the ordinary sense of the term in noticing new books, we feel would be out of place, and we shall not attempt it here. All that is needful for us to do it to lay before our readers a clear but concise statement of what the volume contains, and leave them to judge of its superior merit and value by personal examination and use.

Dr. Westcott gives first full and carefully prepared introductions to the First, Second and Third Epistles of S. John (fifty-six pages), then follows the Greek Text and notes of the First Epistle (over two hundred pages), and the Second and Third Epistles, Greek Text and Notes (twenty-four pages). The Notes are characterized by keen insight into the meaning and force of the original, as well as by an earnest and vigorous effort to set forth the Catholic Faith, as held by the Church, in opposition to heresies of all doubt (whether ancient or modern), in regard to our LORD'S person and work. They will well repay the student who shall strive to make himself thoroughly acquainted with them.

The essays subjoined occupy the latter third of the volume and are both extremely interesting and valuable.

The first is entitled "The Two Empires; the Church and the World;" the second, "The Gospel of Creation;" and the third, "The Relation of Christianity to Art." Although they are not perhaps very closely connected with the work, as an exegesis of the Epistles of S. John, these essays will be found to be not only interesting, as we have said, but also suggestive and profitable reading.

The study of Scripture is, I believe (says Dr. Westcott), for us, the way by which God will enable us to understand His present revelation through history and nature, when once we can feel the divine power of human words, which gather in themselves the results of cycles of intellectual discipline, we shall be prepared to pass from the study of one book to the study of the Divine Library.' And the inquiries which



come before us are not mere literary speculations. The fullness of the Bible, apprehended in its historical development, answers to the fullness of life. If we can come to see in the variety, the breadth, the patience of the past dealings of God with humanity, we shall gain that courageous faith from a view of the whole world which is commonly sought by confining our attention to a little fragment of it.

The learned Professor acknowledges "a feeling of sadness in looking at that which must stand with all its imperfections as the accomplishment of a dream of early youth." But nevertheless he is not without hope that his work will serve "to encourage some students to linger with more devout patience, with more frank questionings than before, over words of S. John." May this hope and this trust have their abundant fulfillment in the experience of every student of God's Holy Word!

*The Words of Christ as Principles of Personal and Social Growth.* By JOHN BASCOM, Author of *Philosophy of Religion*, etc. New York; G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The author avows it as his purpose "to turn attention directly to the words of CHRIST as holding the theory and the only sufficient theory of spiritual growth, the forces and the only sufficient forces wherewith to secure that growth. Whatever else may be doubtful, it is not doubtful that the Spirit of the Gospel is the regenerating power of the world. The question of historic proof as to the exact facts of the Gospels he simply waives, his object being to see whether the assertion "I am the way, the truth and the life," can be sustained and verified by the constitution of the human mind and of society, and by the historical development which is in progress under our very eyes.

The argument which may be drawn from such an investigation may legitimately be urged in disputations with the unbeliever. Provided it be ably conducted it should lead the skeptic to an acknowledgement of the Messiahship of JESUS, the facts of the Gospel and the Inspiration of its writers. Anything short of this is merely rationalism. Merely to prove that those "emotional truths" which are subserving the end of construction and

of life in the serial world are truths of the Gospel is to prove that JESUS was wiser and better than all other teachers.

The theme which our author proposes is a noble one and is ably handled. The chapters on "the Law of Consecration" and on "Individual growth" and portions of other chapters show a master hand. In the last, on "the Natural and the Supernatural" he defines the natural to be the forces expressed in matter—physical laws. The supernatural means the energies or powers which are lifted above the plane of forces expressed in matter. Matter and its forces are natural while mind or spirit is supernatural. A miracle then, is GOD, working His purpose immediately in matter, not being bound to a medium like man. He regards the miraculous element in the life of CHRIST not as any essential part of its intrinsic powers, but "as a natural, inevitable incident of that power, and one of its methods of disclosure."

It is strange that the author could not have employed the same reasoning in regard to inspiration. Man influences the mind of man through a medium. But GOD not being bound to a medium, can influence or command the mind of man directly—which is inspiration. And as the author admits that religion without the supernatural in some form, is not religion, that "religion everywhere and in every way must assume the supernatural" we do not see on what ground he denies the fact of inspiration. And yet on this subject he says, "Inspiration, so far as it means anything beyond the rational and spiritual hold of truth on the human mind is putting authority in the place of reason, and blind obedience in the place of insight." "Reason is the measure and the only measure of truth: when authority enters, it and truth take their departure together." "It has become in the spiritual world that traditional element of menace and feat which prevents our searching the Scriptures through and through till we possess them and are possessed by them."

It would follow then that JESUS CHRIST was the wisest and best of men and so far above His kind as to work miracles, and yet we know the facts of His life and his

discourses from no inspired record. We must take the statements of Gospel history as we would those of any other record, and bring the teachings of those whom CHRIST promised to inspire by the direct gift of the Holy Ghost to the tribunal of our reason.

*History of the Literature of the Scandinavian North, from the Most Ancient Times to the Present.* By FRÉDÉRIC WINKEL HORN, Ph. D. Revised by the Author, and Translated by Rasmus B. Anderson, Author of *Norse Mythology*, with a Bibliography of the Important Books in the English language Relating to the Scandinavian Countries, Prepared for the Translator by THORWALD SOLBERG, of the Library of Congress, Washington. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co.

Although much, of a fragmentary character, has been written of Norse history and literature, yet this book may, justly be said to be a revelation to the English reader. Consistent and trust-worthy knowledge was attainable only from foreign sources, which involved so much labor that most students contented themselves with the deficiency of this factor in their equipment. Now that this full, methodical and admirable translation by Mr. Anderson is accessible no apology will condone ignorance.

The original was written in German. Dr. Horn is a Dane, but prepared his book as an aid to foreign students of Scandinavian Literature. It shows entire familiarity with the field of investigation, and the structure of the book, with the detailed method of treatment, under the general divisions, makes it satisfactory and remunerative reading. It embraces three parts—Icelandic-Danish and Norwegian and Swedish. The most surprising feature of the book is the chapter on modern Icelandic literature in which are shown the intellectual level and general diffusion of knowledge of this people. We confess that the Scandinavian mind, both ancient and modern, has assumed worth and magnitude to us, since the reading of this book, that we did not anticipate. To all who may be in like partial ignorance we commend

the book with the promise of similar profit and pleasure in the revelation afforded.

The bibliographical appendix, prepared by Mr. Solberg, gives a survey of all the literature on the subject, and will afford surprise that so much, of a direct and indirect character, has been written of Scandinavia, and yet so little has been serviceable in making its literature generally known.

*Old Wine and New: Occasional Discourses.* By the REV. JOSEPH CROSS, D.D., LL.D. New York, Thomas Whittaker.

This is the sixth volume from the pen of Dr. Cross within a brief period. The title *Old Wine and New* is given as it contains his earliest and some of his latest discourses. One, on Filial Hope, he preached when sixteen years of age—fifty-five years ago. The latest was produced last year. As a preacher Dr. Cross has many admirers. In the preface he states that he once contemplated an autobiography. He had written a hundred pages, when in an hour of indigestion he committed them to the flames; and as a substitute these discourses represent him in the successive stages of his ministry.

*Doctrines and Duty; or Notes of the Church. Sermons Occasional and Parochial.* By the REV. GEORGE F. CUSHMAN D.D., New York, Thomas Whittaker.

This volume is most appropriately named. The discourses are doctrinal and practical. The titles of the first seven are, *Notes of the Church; The Church of England Protestant and Free; The Unchangeable Faith; A Plea for Unity; Forms of Prayer; Regeneration; The Laying on of Hands.* The remaining eighteen are on topics bearing upon the Christian life and character. All of them, both the doctrinal and the practical, are clear, concise and forcible, and well adapted for the use of lay-readers in congregations where the services of a clergyman may not be had.

*John Foster: Life and Thoughts.* With copious Index. By W. W. EVERTS, D.D. New York; Funk and Wagnalls.

Half a century ago few essayists were better known or more admired than John Foster. He exerted a wide influence upon contemporary thought, while some of his essays left indelible impress upon the characters of the young. Among that class we presume that no book of the kind had a wider circulation or was more generally read and pondered than his *Decision of Character*. Among a less numerous, but more mature and thoughtful class his essays on a *Man's writing Memoirs of Himself*. *The Application of the Epithet Romantic*, and on *Some of the Causes by which Evangelical Religion has been Rendered Unacceptable to Persons of Cultivated Taste*, were very acceptable.

The work before us contains a sketch of Foster's life and a long and minute analysis of his character, habits, style of writing etc. But it is not a little remarkable that where so much is said and well said about him, we fail to find mentioned by name the very works which rendered him most widely known, and extracts from which compose the greater part of this volume. The book presents, as the preface says, "in a form convenient for general circulation, *Memorabilia* of Foster's external, intellectual, literary and religious life. It also furnishes the most extraordinary passages of his writings, so classified and indexed as to make his profound thoughts, brilliant sentiments and striking figures easily available for the illustration of any subject."

*Ethics.* Demonstrated in Geometrical Order and divided into five parts, which treat first of GOD; second, Of the Nature and Origin of the Mind; third, Of the origin and nature of the effects; fourth, Of human bondage, or of the strength of the Affects; fifth, Of the power of the Intellect, or of human liberty. By BENEDICT DE SPINDZA. Translated from the Latin by WILLIAM HALE WHITE. New York: Macmillan & Co.

To the scholarly and profound thinker this book will be remunerative. It will subserve two desirable uses, viz.: 1. It will excite vigorous thought; 2. It will be a revelation of Spinoza's analytic skill and logical power. As part of the literature of philosophy it is important

and this English translation will stir the curiosity of many educated men who would never have made the effort to master the work in its original form. In its present garb it demands unrelaxed attention and much tense thinking to follow intelligibly, the author. In Latin this difficulty must be greater, so that the translation is, what it claims to be, a help in attaining the results of profound ratiocination. †

While we do not see that there is any valuable addition to the knowledge reached, in the same line of investigation, by other thinkers, yet the book is a fine specimen of mental gymnastics and enables the reader to test his own thews by a struggle with one of the intellectual giants of a past age. For its disciplinary quality we more especially commend it to those of our readers who have a taste for abstract reasoning, and who love, anon, to be elevated to the higher and more rarified planes of thought. Occasional fellowship, on the mountain top, with such a teacher is strengthening to the mental and moral fibre.

*Troja.* Results of the Latest Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Homer's Troy, and in the Heroic Tumuli and other sites, made in the year 1882, and a Narrative of a Journey in the Troad in 1881. By Dr. HENRY SCHLIEMANN Hon. D. C. L., Oxon, etc., with a reface by Prof. A. H. SAYCE. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Dr. Schliemann's latest volume is by no means least in interest and importance. It goes over, in part, the same ground as his *Ilios*, a few years ago, and it is in great measure supplemental and illustrative of the main positions taken and established in that volume. The learned Teuton is also as enthusiastic as ever, and has made some considerable corrections and additions to the literature and discussion of the renowned Homeric question. He is not at all shaken in his faith that Hissarlik is the true spot where to look for ancient Troy; but he holds now that Hissarlik represents the Acropolis, and that the town or city extended a long distance below and Southward. He is now induced to think that he was in error



in placing Homer's Troy as superimposed over two earlier towns or settlements, and concludes that the city was really the second in time of building. He argues the question with his usual freeness and confidence; and whether he be right or wrong in the matter, it must be acknowledged that he presents it in a very interesting and pleasing light and showed himself quite the equal of the various opponents of his views in England and elsewhere.

Prof. A. H. Sayce, of Oxford, furnishes an excellent preface of some thirty pages, in which he warmly sustains Schliemann's positions. "The heroes of the Iliad and Odyssey (he says) have become to us men of flesh and blood; we can watch both them, and older heroes still, in almost every act of their daily life, and even determine their nature and the capacity of their skulls. It is little wonder if so marvellous a discovery of a past in which we had ceased to believe, should have awakened many controversies, and wrought a silent revolution in our conceptions of Greek history. It is little wonder if at first the discoverer who had so rudely shocked the settled prejudices, of the historian should have met with a storm of indignant opposition or covert attack. But in this case what was new was also what was true, and, as fact after fact has accumulated and excavation after excavation been systematically carried out, the storm has slowly died away, to be followed by a warm acknowledgment and unreserved acquiescence. To-day no trained archæologist in Greece or Western Europe doubts the main facts which Dr. Schliemann's excavations have established; we can never return again to the ideas of ten years ago." The whole preface is well worth reading, though it may perhaps be thought to be a little overstrained in praise of the author of *Troja* and *Ilios*.

Schliemann's narrative follows in seven chapters, in which he gives a full account of his explorations at Troy and in the Troad in 1882; discusses the various settlements on the hill at Hissarlik, from the first to the seventh; sets forth his examinations of the conical

mounds, called "Heroic Tumuli;" and tells of other explorations in the Troad. A goodly number of notes is added on points of interest to students; and seven valuable appendices follow these, in which Schliemann gives the testimony of such scholars as Virchow, Karl Blind, Professor Neabaffy and others in support of his work. Finally, a very full and exact index brings the volume to a close, and adds materially to the comfort and enjoyment of students and general readers.

The illustrations number 750, and there are several plans and maps, all which are produced in the best style of pictorial art, and are indispensable to the understanding and right appreciation of the work. We may add, that the Messrs. Harper have brought out *Troja* in a style worthy of their House, and that it forms a meet and attractive companion volume to the author's *Ilios*.

5

